

<36610759410017

<36610759410017

Bayer. Staatsbibliothek

Bayer. Staatsbibliothek

Solem

2898² - 2,2

THE
DIVINE LEGATION
OF
MOSES
DEMONSTRATED.

VOL. II. PART II.

BIBLIOTHECA
REGIA
MONACENSIS.

Bb PART

P A R T II.

B O O K V.

S E C T. I.

HAVING now examined the *Character* of the *Jewish* People, and the Talents of their Lawgiver, I come next to consider the Nature of that Policy, which by his Ministry was introduced amongst them. For in these two Enquiries I hope to lay a lasting Foundation for the Support of the third general Proposition, *That the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments is not to be found in, nor did make Part of the Mosaic Dispensation.*

Amongst this People we find a Policy differing from all the Civil Institutions of Mankind: In which the two Societies were perfectly incorporated, with God Almighty, as a *temporal Governor*, at the Head of both.

The peculiar Administration attending so singular a Frame of Government hath always kept it from the Knowledge of superficial Inquirers. *Christian* Writers, by considering *Judaism* as a *Religious Policy* only, or a *Church*; and *Deists*, as a *Civil Policy* only, or a *State*; have run into infinite Mistakes concerning the *Reason, Nature, and End* of its Institutions. And, on so partial a View of it, no Wonder that neither have done Justice to this stupendous Oeconomy. Suppose, the famous Picture of the *Female Centaur* by *Zeuxis*, where two different Natures

Natures were so admirably incorporated, that the Passage from one to the other, as *Lucian* tells us^a, was perfectly insensible; suppose, this had been placed before two competent Judges, yet in such different Points of View, that the one could see only the *animal*, the other only the *human* Part; would not *that* have thought it a beautiful Horse, and *this* as beautiful a Woman; and each have given the Original such Functions as he judged proper to the Species in which he ranked it? But would not both of them have been much deceived? And would not a Sight of the whole have taught them to rectify their Judgments? as knowing that the Functions of such a compound Animal, whenever it existed, must be very different from those of either of the other. From such partial Judges of the Law therefore, little Assistance is to be expected towards the Discovery of its true Nature.

Much less are we to hope from the *Jewish* Doctors, who, though they still inhabit, as it were, the Ruins of this august and awful Fabric; yet it is with the same Barbarity of Taste, and Impotence of Science, that the present *Greeks* hide themselves among the mouldering Monuments of *Attic* Power and Politeness. Who, as our Travellers inform us, can do no more towards the Support of those Prodiges of their Forefathers Art, than to white-wash the *Parian* Marble with Chalk, or to incrust the *Porphyry* and *Granate* with Tiles and Potsherds.

^a Τὴν θήλειαν δὲ ἵππευ γε τὴν καλλίστην, οἷα μάλιστα αἱ Θετταλαὶ εἰσιν, ἀδμήτες, ἔτι, καὶ ἄσφατοι· τὸ δ' ἀνώ ἡμίτομον, γυναικὶς, πάντῃ καλόν, — καὶ ἡ μίξις δὲ, καὶ ἡ ἀρμονία τῶν σωμάτων, καθὼς συνάπτεται καὶ σωθεῖται τῷ γυναικείῳ τὸ ἵππικόν, ἡρέμα, καὶ σὺν ἀθρόῳς μελαβαίνουσα, καὶ ἐκ προσαγωγῆς τρεπομένη, λανθάνει τὸ ὄψιν ἐν θαλίῃ, εἰς τὸ ἕτερον ὑποσφύνη. *Zeuxis.*

But

But least of all shall we receive Light from the muddy Visions of our *English Cocceians*^b; who elated with the low dull Madness of picking Mysteries out of Letters, have sublimed the crude Nonsense of the *Cabala* to I can't tell what kind of Quintessence quite defecated from all the grossness of Meaning.

To understand then the Nature of the *Jewish Oeconomy*, we must begin with this TRUTH, to which every Page of the five Books of *Moses* bears witness, *That the Separation of the Israelites was in order to preserve the Doctrine of the Unity, amidst an idolatrous and polytheistic World.* The Necessity of this Provision we shall shew at large hereafter^c. At present we only desire the Reader would be so civil as to suppose there might be a sufficient Reason. But now, because it is equally true, that this Separation was fulfilling the Promise made to *Abraham* their Father; hence the Deists have taken occasion to represent it as made for the sake of a *favourite People*^d: And then, supposing such a partial Distinction to be inconsistent with the Divine Attributes, have ventured to arraign the *Law* itself of Imposture.

But we shall shew their Representation of the Fact to be both unjust and absurd. They cannot deny that it was God's Purpose, and becoming his Goodness, to preserve the Doctrine of the Unity amidst an idolatrous World. But this could never be effected but by a Separation of one Part from the rest. Nor could such a Separation have been made any otherwise than by bringing that Part under God's peculiar Protection; the Consequence of which were great temporal Blessings. Now as some *one* People must needs be chosen for this Purpose,

^b The Followers of *Hutchinson*.

^c In the Ninth Book.

^d See the first Vol. of the *Div. Leg.* p. 289. 2^d Edit.

it seems most agreeable to our Ideas of Divine Wisdom, which commonly effects many Ends by one and the same Means, to make those attendant Blessings the Reward of some high exalted Virtue in the Progenitors of the chosen People. But therefore to pretend they are chosen *as Favourites*, is both unjust and absurd. The Separation is made for the sake of Mankind in general; tho' *they* become the Instruments, in Reward of their Forefathers Virtues. And this is the Language of those Scriptures which furnish occasion to the Objection. Where God, by the Prophet *Ezekiel*, promises to restore the *Israelites*, after a short *Dispersion through the Countries*, to their own Land, he declares *this* to be the End of their Separation: "Therefore
 " say unto the House of *Israel*, Thus saith the LORD
 " GOD, *I do not this for your sakes, O House of*
 " *Israel, but for mine Holy Name's sake*, which ye
 " have profaned among the Heathen, whither ye
 " went. And I will sanctify my great Name which
 " was profaned amongst the Heathen, which ye
 " have profaned in the midst of them; and the
 " Heathen shall know that I am the LORD, saith
 " the LORD GOD, when I shall be sanctified in you
 " before their Eyes^e." What God himself says of the *People*, St. Paul says of their *Law*: "Where-
 " fore then serveth the *Law*? It was *added because*
 " *of Transgressions*; till the Seed should come, to
 " whom the Promise was made^f." *It was added*, says the Apostle. To what? Surely to the Religion of the Patriarchs. To what End? *because of Transgressions*, i. e. the idolatrous Deviations from that Religion: Into which Idolatry the rest were already gone, and the *Jews* then hastening apace; and from which they could be restrained no otherwise than by

^e EZEK. xxxvi. 22, 23.^f GAL. iii. 19.

this *Addition*, that kept them *separate* from all others, and preserved the Doctrine of the Unity till the *coming of the promised Seed*.

But another thing offends the *Deists*: They cannot understand, let the End of this Choice be what it will, why God should prefer so perverse and sottish a People to all others. One Reason has been given already; that it was for the sake of their Forefathers, and to fulfil the Promise made to the Patriarchs. But we can give them others, very becoming the Ideas we have of infinite Wisdom; as that the extraordinary Providence, by which they were protected, might become the more visible and illustrious. For had they been endowed with the Qualities of the more famous Nations of the World, the Effects of that Providence might have been ascribed to their own Power or Wisdom. Their Impotence and Inability, when left to themselves, is finely represented in the Prophet *Ezekiel*, by the Similitude of the Vine-Tree: *Son of Man, what is the Vine-Tree more than any Tree, or than a Branch which is amongst the Trees of the Forest? Shall Wood be taken thereof to do any Work? or will Men take a Pin of it to hang any Vessel thereon?—Therefore thus saith the Lord God, As the Vine-Tree amongst the Trees of the Forest* &c. For as the Vine, which, with Cultivation and Support is the most valuable of all Trees, becomes the most worthless, when left neglected in its natural State: So the *Jews*, who made so superior a Figure under the particular Protection of God, when, for their Sins that Protection was withdrawn, became the weakest and most contemptible of tributary Nations.

§ Chap. xv. v 3.

SECT.

S E C T. II.

ALLOWING it then to have been God's Design to perpetuate the Knowledge of himself, amidst an idolatrous World, by the Separation of one People from the rest of Mankind; let us see how this Design was brought about, when now the Family he had chosen, was become numerous enough to support itself under a Separation; and Idolatry, that was grown to its most gigantic Stature^h, was necessarily to be repressed.

^h — Il [Ninus fils de Belus] ne peut être inventeur de l'Idolatrie qui étoit bien plus ancienne; je ne dis pas seulement en Egypte, mais même au delà de l'Euphrate, puisque Rachel déroba les Teraphims, &c. — Il faut aller en Egypte pour trouver sur cela quelque chose de mieux fondé. Grotius croit que, du temps de Joseph, l'Idolatrie n'étoit point encore commune en Egypte. Cependant on voit des-lors dans ce pays un extrême attachement à la magie, à la divination, aux augures, à l'interprétation des songes, &c. — Moïse défend d'adorer aucune figure, ni de ce qui est visible dans les cieux, ni de ce qui est sur la terre, ni de ce qui est dans les eaux. Voilà la défense générale d'adorer les Astres, les Animaux, & les Poissons. Le veau d'or étoit une imitation du dieu Apis. La niche de Moloch, dont parle Amos, étoit apparemment portée avec une figure du Soleil. Moïse défend aux Hébreux d'immoler aux boucs, comme ils ont fait autrefois. La mort en l'honneur duquel il défend de faire le Deuil, étoit le même qu'Osiris. Beelphegor, aux mystères duquel ils furent entraînés par les femmes de Madian, étoit Adonis. Moloch cruelle Divinité, à laquelle on immoloit des victimes humaines, étoit commune du tems de Moïse, aussi-bien que ces abominables sacrifices. Les Chananéens adoroient des mouches & d'autres insectes, au rapport de l'auteur de la sagesse. Le même auteur nous parle des Egyptiens d'alors comme d'un peuple plongé dans toutes sortes d'abominations, & qui adoroit toutes sortes d'animaux, même les plus dangereux, & les plus nuisibles. Le pays de Chanaan étoit encore plus corrompu. Moïse ordonne d'y abattre les autels, les bois sacrés, les idoles, les monumens superstitieux. Il parle des enclos, où l'on entretenoit un feu éternel en l'honneur de Soleil. Voilà la plus indubitable époque que nous ayons de l'idolatrie. Mais ce n'est point une

The *Israelites* were, at this Time, groaning under the Yoke of *Egypt*; whither the allwise Provi-

epoque qui nous en montre la source & le commencement, ni même le progrès & l'avancement: Elle nous présente une idolatrie achevée, & portée à son comble; les astres, les hommes, les animaux mêmes adorez comme autant divinitez; la magie, la divination, l'impiété au plus haut point où elles puissent aller; enfin le crime, & les desordres honteux, suites ordinaires du culte superstitieux & de regle. *Calmet Dissert. sur l'Origine de l'Idolatrie*, tom. i. p. 431, 432. Thus far this learned Writer. And without doubt his Account of the early and over-bearing Progress of Idolatry is just. Another learned Writer is in different Sentiments. He thinks its Rise and Progress much lower. *If we look* (says he) *amongst the Canaanites, we shall find no Reason to imagine that there was a Religion different from that of Abraham.* Abraham travelled up and down many Years in this Country, and was respected by the Inhabitants of it, as a Person in great Favour with God, &c. And again, Abraham was entertained by Pharaoh without the Appearance of any Indisposition towards him, or any the least sign of their having a different Religion from that which Abraham himself professed and practised. [*Connect. of Sac. and Prof. Hist.* vol. i. p. 309 and 312.] But here the learned Author was deceived by mere modern Ideas. He did not reflect on that general Principle of *Intercommunity*, so essential to Paganism, which made all its Followers disposed to receive the God of *Abraham* as a true tho' tutelary Deity. *Josephus*, whose very Age could not but give him a right Notion of this matter, saw well the Consistency between the Respect and Veneration paid to *Abraham's* God, and their being Idolaters, who paid it; as appears from his making that Patriarch the first who propagated the Belief of one God, after the whole Race of Mankind was sunk into Idolatry; and at the same time making all those own the Patriarch's God with whom he had to do. Of *Abraham* he speaks thus, Ἀπὸ τῆτο καὶ φρονεῖν ἐπ' ἀρετῇ μείζω τῶν ἄλλων ἡγήσατο, καὶ τὸ θεῶν ἑξ ἑνὸς δόξαν, ὡς ἅπανι σωζομένην εἶναι, καίνισαι καὶ μετεβαλὼν εἶναι. Πρῶτον δὲ τοιοῦτον Θεὸν ἀπεφήνατο δημοφιλῶν τῶν ὅλων ἑνα. 1. i. c. 7. He makes the idolatrous Priests of *Egypt* tell *Pharaoh* at once, that the Pestilence was sent from God in Punishment for his intended Violation of the Stranger's Wife: καὶ μὲν Θεὸς τὸ δεινὸν αὐτῷ παρεῖναι ἀπεσήμαινον οἱ ἱερεῖς, ἐφ' οἷς ἐβόησαν ἐνθρόνισαι ἑ ξένου καὶ γυναῖκα. c. 8. And *Abimelech*, in the same Circumstances, as readily to own the same Author of his Punishment. Φράζει πρὸς τὰς φίλδς· ὡς ὁ Θεὸς αὐτῷ ταύτῃ ἐπαγάγοι τὴν νόσον ὑπὲρ ἐκδικίας τῆς ξένης, φυλάσων αὐτὴν εἶναι αὐτῷ καὶ γυναῖκα. c. 12. *Antiq.*

dence

dence of GOD had conducted themⁱ, while they were yet few in Number, and in Danger of mixing and confounding themselves with the rest of the Nations. In this Distress, one of their own Brethren is sent to them with a Message from GOD, by the Name and Character of the God of their Fathers, whose Merit he had promised to reward with distinguished Blessings on their Posterity. The Message, accompanied with *Signs and Wonders*, denounced their speedy Deliverance from *Egyptian Bondage*, and secure Possession of the Land of *Canaan*, the Scene of all the promised Blessings. The People hearken and are delivered. They depart from *Egypt*; and in the third Month from their Departure, come to Mount *Sinai*. Here GOD first tells them by their Leader *Moses*, that, *if they would obey his Voice indeed, and keep his Covenant, then they should be a peculiar Treasure to him above all People, for that the whole Earth was his^k*. The People consent^l; and GOD delivers the Covenant to them, in the Words of the *two Tables^m*.

But this Promise, of their being received for GOD's peculiar People, could be *visibly* performed no otherwise than by their *Separation* from the rest of Mankind. As on the other hand, their *Separation* could not have been effected without this *visible* Protectionⁿ. The better, therefore, to secure this Separation, GOD proposes to them to become their KING^o. And, for Reasons that will be explained

ⁱ See p. 348. ^k Ex. xix. 5. ^l y 8. ^m Chap. xx.

ⁿ Thus *Moses* in his Intercession for the People: *For wherein shall it be known here, that I and thy People have found Grace in thy Sight? Is it not in that thou goest with us? So shall we be separated, I and thy People, from all the People that are upon the Face of the Earth.* EXOD. xxxiii. 16.

^o — “And ye shall be unto me a KINGDOM OF PRIESTS, and an holy Nation. — And all the People answered together and said, All that the Lord hath spoken we will do.”

anon, condescends to receive the *Magistracy*, on their free Choice. He then delivers them a Digest of their civil and religious Laws, and settles the whole Constitution both of Church and State. Thus the Almighty becoming their *King*, in as real a Sense as he was their God, the Republic of the *Israelites* was properly a THEOCRACY; in which the two Societies, *Civil* and *Religious*, must, of Course, be intirely incorporated. A *Thing* neither attended to nor understood. The *Name* indeed is of familiar Use: but how little is meant by it, is seen from hence, that those, who, out of Form, are accustomed to call it a *Theocracy*, yet, in their Reasonings about it, consider it as a mere *Aristocracy* under the Judges; and as a mere *Monarchy* under the Kings. Whereas, in truth, it was neither one nor the other, but a real proper *Theocracy*.

Thus was this famed *Separation* made. But it will be asked, Why in so extraordinary a Way? A Way, in which the *sagacious* Deist can discover nothing but the Marks of the Legislator's Fraud, and of his People's Superstition. As to what a mere human Lawgiver could gain by such a Project, will be seen hereafter. At present I shall shew, in direct Answer to the Objection, that a THEOCRACY WAS NECESSARY, as this *Separation* could be effectually made in no other manner.

It appears, from what hath been said above, that the *Israelites* had ever a violent Propensity to mix with the neighbouring Nations, and to devote themselves to the Practices of Idolatry: This *would* naturally, and *did*, in Fact, absorb large Portions of them. And the human Means which preserved

EXOD. xix. 6, 8. For where *God* is *King*, every *Subject* is a *Priest* in some sense or other; because in that case Civil Obedience must have in it the Nature of Religious Ministration.

the

the Remainder, was the Severity of their Civil Laws against Idolatry^p. Such an Institute therefore was necessary to support a Separation. But *Penal Laws*, enforced by the *Magistrate*, in *Matters of Opinion*, are manifestly unjust. Some Way therefore was to be contrived in this Case to render such Laws equitable. For we are not to suppose God would ordain any that should violate the Rule of natural Justice. But such Laws are equitable only in a *Theocracy*: therefore was a THEOCRACY NECESSARY.

That the *Punishment of Opinions*, by *Civil Laws*, is agreeable to the Rules of natural Justice under a *Theocracy*, I shall now endeavour to prove.

Infidels and *intolerant Christians* have both tried to make their Advantage of this Part of the *Mosaic Institution*. The *one* using it as an Argument against the Divinity of the *Jewish Religion*, on a Presumption that such penal Laws are contrary to natural Equity; and the *other* bringing it to defend their intolerant Principles by the Example of Heaven itself. But they are both equally deceived by their Ignorance in the Nature of a *Theocracy*: which, rightly understood, clears the *Jewish Law* from an embarrassing Objection, and leaves the Rights of

^p “ If there be found amongst you, within any of thy Gates
 “ which the LORD thy God giveth thee, Man or Woman that
 “ hath wrought Wickedness in the Sight of the LORD thy
 “ God in transgressing his Covenant, and hath gone and served
 “ other Gods, and worshipped them, either the Sun, or the
 “ Moon, or any of the Host of Heaven, which I have not
 “ commanded; and it be told thee, and thou hast heard of it,
 “ and enquired diligently, and behold, it be true, and the thing
 “ certain, that such Abomination is wrought in *Israel*; then
 “ shalt thou bring forth that Man or that Woman (which have
 “ committed that wicked thing) unto thy Gates, even that Man
 “ or that Woman, and shalt stone them with Stones till they
 “ die.” DEUT. xvii. 2, 3, 4, 5.

Mankind free from the Suspicion of any religious Violation.

Mr. *Bayle*, in an excellent Treatise for Toleration, when he comes to examine the Arguments of the *Intolerants*, takes notice of that which they bring from the Example in Question. “The
“ fourth Objection (says he) may arise from hence,
“ that the Law of *Moses* gives no Toleration to
“ Idolaters, and false Prophets, whom it punishes
“ with Death; and from what the Prophet *Elijah*
“ did to the Priests of *Baal*, whom he ordered to
“ be destroyed without Mercy. From whence it
“ follows, that all the Reasons I have employed,
“ in the first Part of this Commentary, prove no-
“ thing, because they prove too much; namely,
“ that the literal Sense of the Law of *Moses*, as far
“ as relates to the Punishment of Opinions, would
“ be impious and abominable. Therefore, since
“ God could, without violating the eternal Order of
“ Things, command the *Jews* to put false Prophets
“ to Death, it follows, evidently, that he could,
“ under the Gospel also, command Orthodox Belie-
“ vers to inflict the same Punishment upon He-
“ retics.

“ I am not, if I rightly know myself, of that
“ Turn of Mind, so thoroughly corrupted by the
“ Contagion of Controversy, as to treat this Ob-
“ jection with an Air of Haughtiness and Con-
“ tempt; as is the Way when Men find themselves
“ incapable of answering to the Purpose. I inge-
“ nuously own the Objection to be strong; and that
“ it seems to be a Mark of God’s sovereign Plea-
“ sure that we should not arrive at Certainty in any
“ Thing, seeing he hath given Exceptions in his
“ holy Word to almost all the common Notices of
“ Reason. Nay I know some who have no greater
“ Difficulties to hinder their Believing, that God
“ was

“ was the Author of the Laws of *Moses*, and of all
 “ those Revelations that occasioned so much Slaugh-
 “ ter and Devastation, than this very Business of
 “ Intolerance, so contrary to our clearest Ideas of
 “ natural Equity^q. ”

Whether Mr. *Bayle* himself was one of these backward Believers, as by some of his Expressions he gives us Reason to suspect, is not very material. That he dwelt with Pleasure on this Circumstance, as he thought it favoured his darling Scepticism, is but too evident. But sure he went a little too far in this Extravagance, when he said God's *Word* contained Exceptions to almost all the common Notices of Reason^r. I hope to shew, before I have done with Infidelity, that it contains Exceptions to none. But the Solution of this Difficulty was above his Strength, had he been ever so willing to reconcile *Scripture* to Reason. The Truth is, *Judea* was a mere *Terra incognita* to this great Adventurer. Our excellent Countryman Mr. *Locke*, who wrote about this Time on the same Subject, and with that Force and Precision which is the Character of all his Writings, was much happier in his Account of the Matter. *As to the Case* (says he) *of the Israelites in the Jewish Commonwealth, who being initiated into the Mosaical Rites, and made Citizens of the Commonwealth, did afterwards apostatize from the Worship of the GOD of Israel; These were proceeded against as Traytors and Rebels, guilty of no less than high Treason. For the Commonwealth of the Jews, different, in that, from all others, was an absolute Theocracy; nor was there, nor could there be, any*

^q Voions presentement cette iv. Objection. On la peut tirer de ce que la loi de Moïse, &c. *Commentaire Philosophique*, Part ii. Chap. 4.

^r — par les exceptions qu'il a mises dans sa parole à presque toutes les notions communes de la Raison.

Difference between the Commonwealth and the Church. The Laws established there concerning the Worship of the one invisible Deity were the Civil Laws of that People, and a Part of their political Government, in which GOD himself was the Legislator^s. This he said; and for ought I can learn, he was the first that said it. So that the Remark was as new as it is solid. But this being all he said,

I shall endeavour to support it by such other Observations as occurred to me on first reading the Objection in Mr. Bayle, and before I had seen the Solution in Mr. Locke's Treatise, or known that he or any other else had given it. It will be necessary then to observe, that GOD, in his infinite Wisdom, was pleased to stand in two *arbitrary* Relations towards the *Jewish* People, besides that *natural* one, in which he stood towards them, and the rest of Mankind in common. The *first* was that of a *tutelary Deity, gentilitial and local*; the GOD of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*, who was to bring their Posterity into the Land of *Canaan*, and to protect them there, as his peculiar People. The *second* was that of *supreme Magistrate and Lawgiver*. And in both these Relations he was pleased to refer it to the People's free Choice, whether or no they would receive him for their God and King. For a *tutelary Deity* was supposed, by the Ancients, to be as much Matter of Election as a *civil Magistrate*. The People, therefore, thus solemnly accepting him, these necessary Consequences followed from the *Horeb* Contract.

I. *First*, that as the national GOD, and civil Magistrate of the *Jews*, centered in one and the same Object, their civil Policy and Religion must be in-

^s *Letter concerning Toleration*, p. 51, 52.

timately

timately united and incorporated^t, consequently, their Religion had, and very reasonably, a *public Part*, whose *Subject* was the *Society* as such: Tho' *this Part*, in the national *Pagan Religions*, which had it likewise, was extremely absurd, as hath been shewn more at large in the first Volume^v.

II. *Secondly*, as the two Societies were thoroughly incorporated, they could not be distinguished; but must stand or fall together. Consequently the Direction of all their civil Laws must be for the equal Preservation of both. Therefore, as the renouncing him for *King*, was the throwing him off as *GOD*; and as the renouncing him for *GOD*, was the throwing him off as *King*; *Idolatry*, which was the rejecting him as *GOD*, was properly the *crimen læsæ Majestatis*; and so justly punishable by the civil Laws. But there was this manifest Difference in these two Cases, as to the Effects. The renouncing *GOD* as *civil Magistrate* might be remedied without a total Dissolution of the Constitution; not so the renouncing him as *tutelary GOD*. Because, though he might, and did^w appoint a Deputy in his Office of *King*, amongst the *Jewish Tribes*; he would have no Substitute, as *GOD*, amongst the *Pagan Deities*. Therefore, in Necessity as well as Right, *Idolatry* was punishable by the civil Laws of a *Theocracy*; it being the greatest Crime that could be committed against the State, as tending, by certain Consequence, to dissolve the Constitution. For the one *GOD* being the supreme Magistrate, it

^t Such a kind of Union and Incorporation was most absurdly affected by *Mahomet* in Imitation of the *Jewish Oeconomy*; whence it appears, as might be expected, that neither he nor his Assistants understood any thing of its true Nature.

^v P. 96, & seq. Ed. 2^d.

^w The Kings of *Israel* and *Judah* being, as we shall shew, indeed no other.

subsisted in the Worship of that God alone. *Idolatry*, therefore, as the Renunciation of *one God alone*, was in a strict Philosophic, as well as Legal Sense, the Crime of *lese Majesty*. Let us observe farther, that as, by such Incorporation, religious Matters came under *Civil* Consideration, so likewise civil Matters came under *Religious*. This is what *Josephus* would say, where, in his *second Book against Apion*, speaking of the *Jewish* Theocracy, he tells us that *Moses* did not make *Religion a Part of Virtue*, but *Virtue a Part of Religion*^x. The Meaning is, that, as in all *human Societies*, Obedience to the Law is *moral Virtue*, under a *Theocracy*, it is *Religion*.

III. The Punishment of Idolatry, by Law, had this farther Circumstance of Equity, that it was punishing the Rebellion of those who had chosen the Government under which they lived, when freely proposed to them. Hence, in the Law against *Idolatry*, the Crime is, with great Propriety, called the TRANSGRESSION OF THE COVENANT^y.

Thus we see, the Law in Question stands clear of the Cavils of Infidels, and the Abuse of intolerant Believers^z.

^x Αἴτιον δ' ὅτι καὶ τὰ νόμιμα τῆς νομοθεσίας πρὸς τὸ χρησίμου πάντων αἰεὶ πολὺ διωύεσκεν· ὃ γὰρ μέγας τῆ ἀρετῆς ἐποίησε τὴν δόξάν, ἀλλὰ ταύτης τὰ μέρη τὰλλα σωεῖδε καὶ κατέστησε· λέγω ὅτι δικαιοσύνην, καὶ κατερίαν, ἡσυχασίαν, καὶ τὴν πολιτικὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐν ᾧ πανσὶ συμφωνίαν. p. 483. Hav. Ed.

^y DEUT. xvii. 2.

^z These Considerations will lead us to a right Apprehension of that Part of the History of *Jesus*, where *James* and *John*, on the inhospitable Behaviour of a Village of *Samaria*, say to their Master, in the Spirit of the *Jewish* Law, Lord, wilt thou that we command Fire to come down from Heaven and consume them, even as *Elias* did? But he turned, and rebuked them, and said, Ye know not what manner of Spirit ye are of. For the Son of Man is not come to destroy Mens Lives, but to save them. [LUKE ix. 54, 55, 56.] i. e. You consider not that you are no longer under

But to this, the Defenders of the *common Rights of Subjects* will be apt to object, that these *penal Laws* were unjust, because no Contract, to give up the Rights of Conscience, can be binding.

the *Jewish Dispensation*, in which a Severity of this kind was just and necessary; but under the Dispensation of Grace, in which all Restraint and Punishment of Opinions would be mischievous and unlawful. The Reason is admirable, *The Son of Man is not come to destroy Mens Lives, but to save them.* As much as to say, the burning Mens Bodies would be an ill Demonstration of my Regard for their Souls. Now here we see, the *very Disposition* to Intolerance in *James* and *John*, is severely censured. Yet the same Temper in *Paul*, even when proceeding into act, is passed over without Reproof; when *Jesus* is pleased, after his Resurrection, to restrain it in a miraculous manner. Here *Jesus* condemns not the Nature of the Practice, but only declares the Fruitlessness of its Effects, *It is hard for thee to kick against the Pricks.* [ACTS ix. 5.] The Reason of the different Treatment is evident. *James* and *John* had given their Names to the Religion of *Jesus*; in which all Force was unjust. *Paul* was yet of the Religion of *Moses*, where Restraint was lawful. Thus *Paul* himself, when speaking of his Merits, as a *Jew*, says, *For ye have heard of my Conversation in time past; how that beyond measure I persecuted the Church of God, and wasted it: And profited in the Jews Religion above many my Equals in mine own Nation.* [GAL. i. 13.] And again, *Though I might also have Confidence in the Flesh. If any other Man thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust in the Flesh, I more: Circumcised the eighth Day, of the Stock of Israel, of the Tribe of Benjamin, an Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the Law, a Pharisee; concerning Zeal, persecuting the Church; touching the Righteousness which is in the Law, blameless. But what Things were Gain to me, those I counted Loss for Christ.* [PHIL. iii. 4.] Here he glories in the Action, as plainly meritorious. And so indeed it was, in a *Jew*. Yet where he speaks of it, while considering himself in his present Character of a *Christian*, he condemns it as horrid and detestable: and this, in order to shew his Followers how it ought to be regarded in the Religion of *Jesus*. To the *Corinthians* he says, *I am the least of the Apostles; that am not meet to be called an Apostle, because I persecuted the Church of God.* [1 EP. xv. 9.] And to *Timothy*, *I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, who hath enabled me, for that he counted me faithful, putting me into the Ministry; who was before a Blasphemer, and a Persecutor, and injurious. But I obtained Mercy, because I did it*

To

To which I reply, with this plain and decisive Fact, That none of all the idolatrous Worship the *Jews* ever committed, from the Time of giving the Law to the total Dissolution of the Republic, was MATTER OF CONSCIENCE; but always of Convenience; such as procuring some temporal Good, which they wantonly affected, or averting some temporal Evil, which they servilely feared. The Truth of which appears from hence, that, in the midst of all their Idolatries, the God of their Fathers, as we shall see, was ever owned to be the Creator and first Cause of all Things; and the Religion taught by *Moses*, to be a Revelation from Heaven.

But it may be asked, What if their Idolatry *had*, at any Time, proved Matter of Conscience?

I reply, the Question had been pertinent had the Law in Dispute been of human Establishment. But it was given by God, who knows the *future* equally with the *past* and *present*; and so knew the Case would never happen. The Question indeed points out the Danger and Absurdity of any *human* Legislature's making penal Laws in this Matter, on any Pretence whatsoever.

Thus it is seen, that a Separation, so necessary for the Preservation of the *Unity*, could not have been supported without penal Laws against Idolatry; and that *such* can be equitably established only under a *Theocracy*. The Consequence is, that a Theocracy was *necessary*. But this Form of Government was highly convenient likewise. The *Israelites*, on their *Egression* out of *Egypt*, were sunk into the grossest

in IGNORANCE and UNBELIEF. [1 Ep. i. 12.] *i. e.* being a *Jew*. And now, I hope, we shall never see these Passages brought again as Instances of St. *Paul's* Contradictions: Who, to say the least of him, certainly writ with more Care than these Men are accustomed to read.

Super-

Superstitions of Idolatry. To recover them, therefore, by this Discipline of a Separation, it was necessary that the Idea of GOD and his Attributes should be impressed upon them in the most sensible manner. But this could not well be done, consistently with Truth, under his Character as GOD: Under that of *King* it might, and with great Propriety. Hence it is we find him in the Old Testament so frequently represented with human Passions. The civil Relation, in which he stood to these People, justified such a Representation; and the Grossness of their Conceptions made the Representation necessary. Hence another Instance of the Wisdom of this Oeconomy; and of the Folly of *Spinoza*, and others, who would conclude from it, that *Moses* and the Prophets had themselves gross Conceptions of the divine Nature. Nor should the Indiscretion of those Divines pass uncensured, who have pretended that God, in the *Old Testament*, looks on Man with a less gracious and benign Aspect, than in the *New*. An Imagination, that gave birth to one of the most absurd and monstrous Opinions of ancient Heresy; and hath since furnished modern Infidelity with an Occasion to blaspheme^a. But the God of the Universe, when representing himself under that Idea, gives one uniform Revelation of his Nature throughout all his Dispensations, *as gracious and full of Compassion; as good to ALL, and whose tender Mercies are OVER ALL HIS WORKS*. Yet condescending to become the tutelary God, and civil Magistrate of the *Jews*, it must needs be that he should be considered as having his peculiar Care attached to this People, and as punishing their

^a *It must be owned (says Tyndal) that the same Spirit (I dare not call it a Spirit of Cruelty) does not alike prevail throughout the Old Testament: the nearer we come to the Times of the Gospel, the milder it appeared.* Christ. as old as the Creation, p. 241.

Transgressions with Severity. But this Matter will be handled more at large, in the *seventh* Book; where, from the very Nature of a *Theocracy*, I shall shew, how all the material Difficulties that have been objected to the *Jewish* Dispensation are cleared up, and reconciled to our human Ideas of eternal Justice.

These were the true Reasons of the *Theocratic* Form of Government: Which I have been the fuller in explaining, because they seem to have been little understood either by *Jewish* or *Christian* Writers. The former, deceived by the silly Prejudice of their being chosen as the Favourites of Heaven, gravely assign this Reason for God's taking the Civil Magistracy on himself. *As a Man* (says *Abarbanel*) *who hath collected together Silver, Gold, and precious Utensils, is not wont to commit them to the Trust of any of his Servants, but secures them in his Treasury under his own Care; so Israel shall be under the Government of the Divine Providence, and not be delivered over to any other Lord or Prince*^b. *Spencer* hath wrote a professed Dissertation *de Theocratia Judaica*; and, in his third Chapter, hath attempted to give the various Reasons of this Mode of Government^c. But with how little Success I chuse the Reader should rather learn from his own Work, than from my Censure of it.

II.

We come, in the next place, to shew, that this *Theocracy*, as it was *necessary*, so it would have a

^b Quemadmodum homo, qui acquisivit sibi argentum & aurum & vasa desiderabilia, ea nulli servorum committit, sed ipsemet eorum in thesauris suis reconditorum curam gerit; ita Israel erit sub gubernatione providentiæ divinæ, nunquam alteri principi vel domino tradendus. *Comment. in Pentat.*

^c Regiminis hujusce divini variae rationes assignantur. Tit. cap. 3.

very easy Reception: Being founded on the flattering Notion of *tutelary Deities*, gentilitial and local, at that Time universally entertained. Thus the Almighty represented himself to this Race, at first, as a *gentilitial God*, *The God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*^d: And afterwards as a *local Deity*, who had preferred *Judea*, which he had chosen for his peculiar Residence, to all other Countries whatsoever; on which Account it is generally characterised, in the sacred Writings, by the Name of *HIS LAND*^e. The Notion of *local Deities* was an established Point in *Paganism*, as we have seen above from *Plato*. It was originally *Egyptian*; and consisted in an Opinion that the Earth was at first divided by the Creator amongst a Number of inferior and subordinate Divinities. The *Septuagint* Translators appear to have understood the following Passage, in the Song of *Moses*, as alluding to this Opinion, *When the most high divided to the Nations their Inheritance, when he separated the Sons of Adam, he set the Bounds of the People according to the Number of the Children of Israel. For the Lord's Portion is his People: Jacob is the Lot of his Inheritance*^f. For instead of *according to the Number of the Children of Israel* (which, if they found in the Text, they understood no more than later Critics) they wrote κατὰ ἀριθμὸν Ἀγγέλων Θεῶν, *according to the Number of the Angels of God*. Which at least is intelligible, as referring to that old Notion, original to the Place of this Translation. And *Justin Martyr* tells us^g, that in the Beginning, God had committed the Government

^d See JER. x. 16. and li. 19.

^e LEVIT. xxv. 23. DEUT. xi. 12. Ps. x. 16. Is. xiv. 25. JER. ii. 7. Chap. xvi. § 18. EZEK. xxxv. 10. Chap. xxxvi. § 5, 20, Chap. xxxviii. § 16. WISD. OF SOL. xii. 7.

^f DEUT. xxxii. 8, 9. ^g *Apologet.* i.

of the World to the Angels, who, abusing the Trust reposed in them, were degraded from their Regency. But whether he learnt it from hence, or took it from a worse Place, I will not pretend to determine.

The Land, thus selected by God for his peculiar Residence, he bestows upon his chosen People. *Behold* (says he) *the Land of Canaan which I give unto the Children of Israel for a Possession^h*. This too was according to the common Notions of those Times. Thus *Jephthah*, who appears to have been much paganized by an ill Education, speaks to the King of the *Ammonites*, *Wilt not thou possess that which Chemosh thy GOD giveth thee to possess? So whomsoever the Lord our GOD shall drive out from before us, them will we possessⁱ*.

It was no Wonder then, when GOD was thus pleased, for the wise Ends of his Providence, to be considered, by a prejudiced People, under this Idea, that all the *Pagan Nations* round about should regard the GOD of *Israel* as a local tutelary Deity; too apt, by their Prejudices alone, to consider him in that View. Thus he is called the GOD of *the Land^k*, *the GOD of the Hills^l*, &c. And it is expressly said, that *they spoke against the GOD of Jerusalem, as against the Gods of the People of the Earth, which were the Work of the Hands of Man^m*. By which is only meant, that they treated him as a local tutelary Deity, of a confined and bounded Power. For it was not the old *Pagan* way to *speak against* one another's Gods, in Discredit of their Divinity; and this circumscribed Dominion was esteemed no Discredit to it.

^h DEUT. xxxii. 49.

ⁱ JUDG. xi. 24.

^k 2 KINGS xvii. 26. Chap. xviii. v 33, & seq.

^l 1 KINGS xx. 23.

^m 2 CHRON. xxxii. 19.

Yet here we must observe, that when GOD, agreeably to the whole Method of this Dispensation, takes Advantage of, or indulges his People in any habituated Notion or Custom, he always interweaves some characteristic Note of Difference to mark the Institution for his own. Thus in this Indulgence of their Prejudices concerning a *tutelary* GOD,

1. He first institutes, upon it, a *Theocracy*; a Practice just the *reverse* of *Paganism*: For their Kings became Gods; whereas here GOD condescended to become Kingⁿ.

2. Secondly, he forbids all kind of *Community* between the GOD of *Israel* and the Gods of the *Nations*, either by joining their Worship to his, or so much as owning their Divinity. This was distinguishing the *Israelites* from all other People in the most effectual Manner. For, as we have often had Occasion to observe, there was a general *Intercommunity* amongst the Gods of *Paganism*. They acknowledged one another's Pretensions; they bor-

ⁿ It is strange to consider how much Dr. *Spencer* has mistaken this matter, where, in his *Reasons of a Theocracy ex parte seculi*, as he calls them, he gives the following: “*Seculi moribus* “ *ita factum erat, ut Dii sui principatum quendam inter servos* “ *suos obtinerent, & nomine ritumque regio colerentur. Nam se-* “ *culo illo Deos titulis illis Molech, Elohim, Baalim & hujusmodi* “ *aliis, regibus & magnatibus tribui solitis, insignire solebant;* “ *eos imperii arbitros plerunque ponebant, cum nec bella ge-* “ *rere, nec civitatem condere, nec regem eligere, nec grandius* “ *aliquid moliri solerent, priusquam Deos per oracula vel aus-* “ *picia consulissent.*” *Differ. de Theoc. Jud. c. iii. p. 237. Ed. Chap.* But these are no Marks that the Pagans attributed any kind of *Civil Regality* to their Gods. As to their *regal Titles*, those were what they had retained from the Time of their real Kingship in the State of Humanity. And as to the consulting their Oracles, on all public Affairs of Moment, this was the Consequence of Pagan Religion's having a *public as well as private Part*. But for an acknowledged God to be chosen and received by any People as their real Monarch or Civil Magistrate, was a thing altogether unknown to Paganism.

rowed one another's Names ; and, at length, entered into a kind of Partnership of Worship. All the *Pagan* Nations, we see, owned the God of *Israel* for a tutelary Deity°. But his Followers were not to be so complaisant. There was to be no Fellowship between God and *Belial* ; though there might, between *Belial* and *Dagon*.

But amidst a vast Number of characteristic Circumstances proving the Origin of the *Mosaic* Religion to be different from that of every other Nation, there is none more illustrious than this, that the *Mosaic* Religion was *built* upon a former, namely the *Patriarchal*: Whereas the various Religions of the *Pagan* World were all *unrelated* to, and *independent* of any other P.

And yet the famous Author of *The Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion* hath been hardy enough to employ one whole Chapter to prove that *this Method of introducing Christianity into the World, by building and grounding it on the Old Testament, is agreeable to the common Method of introducing new Revelations, whether real or PRETENDED, or any Changes in Religion, and also to the Nature of Things*^q.
 “ For if (says he) we consider the various *Revolu-*
 “ *tions and Changes in Religion*, whereof we have
 “ any tolerable History, in their Beginning, we
 “ shall find them for the most part to be grafted on
 “ some old Stock, or founded on some preceding
 “ *Revelations*, which they were either to supply, or
 “ fulfil, or retrieve from corrupt Glosses, Innova-
 “ tions, and Traditions, with which by Time they
 “ were incumbered: and this, which MAY SEEM
 “ MATTER OF SURPRISE TO THOSE, WHO DO NOT
 “ REFLECT on the changeable Nature of all Things,

° 2 KINGS xviii. 25. JER. iv. 2, 3.

P See Vol. i. p. 279, & seq. Ed. 2. ^q *Grounds and Reasons*, &c. p. 20.

“ hath happened; though the old *Revelations* far
 “ from intending any Change, Ingraftment, or
 “ new Dispensation, *did for the most part declare*
 “ *they were to last for ever*, and did forbid all Al-
 “ terations and Innovations, they being the *last*
 “ *Dispensation* intended ^r. ”

Here are two Things asserted: 1. That the building *new* Religions and Revelations upon *old* was agreeable to the common Method of the ancient World. 2. That it was agreeable to the Nature of Things. These are *Discoveries* one would little have expected.

Let us examine his Proofs. But to judge truly of their Force, we must remember, that the Observation is made to discredit what Believers call *true* Revelation, as shewing that all *false* Religions have taken the same Method of Propagation.

I. His first Point is, *That this Method was agreeable to the common Practice of the ancient World*. Would not every one now expect an Instance of some confessedly false Religion, between the Time of *Abraham* and CHRIST, that pretended to be built on some preceding Revelation? Without doubt; if it were only for this, that there is no other Way of proving the Proposition. Besides, to say the Truth, such an Instance would be well worth a little Expectation for its mere Novelty. But he could not give the Reader what was not to be had: And therefore endeavours to make up this Deficiency of Fact, by shewing, 1. That the *Jewish* Religion, like the *Christian*, pretended to be built on a Preceding. “ Thus the Mission of *Moses* to the *Israelites* supposed a former Revelation of God (who
 “ from the Beginning seems to have been constantly
 “ giving a Succession of Dispensations and Revela-
 “ tions) to their Ancestors; and many of the reli-

“gious Precepts of *Moses* were borrowed, or had
“an Agreement with the religious Rites of the
“*Heathens*, with whom the *Israelites* had Cor-
“respondence, and particularly with the religious
“Rites of the *Egyptians*, (who upon that Account
“seem confounded with the *Israelites* by some
“*Pagans*, as both their religious Rites were equally,
“and at the same Time, prohibited by others) to
“whose religious Rites the *Israelites* seem to have
“been *Conformists* during their Abode in *Egypt*.”
Excellentlly argued. To prove that *false* Revelations
had the same Pretensions of Dependency on a Pre-
ceding, as the *true*, he shews that *all* the *true*
had these Pretensions. But this is but half the Cu-
riosity. The best Part is still behind. 'Tis a
Blunder ingrafted on a Sophism. A Rarity pecu-
liar to our Author's Art of Cultivation, and well
deserving to be described. He was not content to
say that *Moses* founded his Religion on the Pa-
triarchal: he would go on, *And many of the reli-
gious Precepts of Moses were borrowed, or had an
Agreement with the religious Rites of the Heathens,
with whom the Israelites had Correspondence, and
particularly with the religious Rites of the Egyptians.*
Now how *Moses's* Borrowing from the religious
Rites of the *Egyptians*, whose Religion he for-
mally condemned of *Falshood*, becomes an Instance
of one Religion's being founded upon, or receiv-
ing Authority from another, I confess surpasses my
Comprehension. If he were not a *Freethinker*,
I should here suspect some Confusion of Ideas:
And that the great Reasoner was utterly unable
to distinguish between *a Religion's supporting itself
on one preceding, which it acknowledged as true;*
*And a Religion's complying, for the sake of inveterate
Prejudices, with some innocent Practices of another*

Religion, which it was erected to overthrow as false.

2. He shews next, that those *false Religions* which came AFTER the *Jewish* and *Christian*, and are confessed to mimick their Peculiarities, pretended to be built on preceding Revelations. “The
“ *Mission of Zoroaster* to the *Persians* supposed the
“ Religion of the *Magians*; which had been, for
“ many Ages past, the antient national Religion of
“ the *Medes* as well as *Persians*. The *Mission of*
“ *Mahomet* supposed *Christianity*, as that did *Ju-*
“ *daism*.”

This is still better. The Design of his Observation, *that it was the common Method for new Revelations to be built and grounded on preceding Revelations*, was to shew (among other Things) that the Revelations which we call *true* imitated the *false*. And he proves it, — by shewing that the *false* imitated the *true*. That *Mahomet*’s did so is agreed on all hands. And those who would have us credit the Story of a *late Zoroaster*, do, and must suppose that he borrowed from *Judaism*. But the Truth is, ’tis an idle Tale, invented by *Persian* Writers under the first Califs. However, tho’ the *Zoroaster* of *Hyde* and *Prideaux* be a mere Phantom, yet the Religion called by his Name, was a real thing, and about the Age of *Mahomet*’s, as shall be proved in its Place. This Argument, therefore, was in all Respects worthy of him.

3. And lastly, he tells us, that “the *Siamese*
“ and *Brachmans* both pretend that they have had
“ a *Succession of incarnate Deities* amongst them,
“ who at due Distances of Time, have brought
“ new Revelations from Heaven, each succeeding
“ one depending on the former; and that Religion
“ is to be conveyed on, in that way, for ever.”

He *promised to prove* a Succession of Religions in the ancient World, the later founded and depending on the preceding: And *he proves* — a Succession of *incarnate Deities* talked of amongst the *modern Pagans of India and Siam!* and, from this Succession concludes a Succession of *depending* Religions, of which they have no kind of Notion. And those Extravagancies which their Priests do indeed talk of, are only late Inventions to oppose to *Mahometans* and *Christian Missionaries*. But a Succession of *incarnate Deities* was so arch a Ridicule on the Mysteries of the *Christian Faith*, that it was to be brought in at any rate. But now the poor Joke is over, let me ask, Were not *Cælus, Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, &c.* a Succession of *incarnate Deities*? yet were any of the Religions, which had those Gods for their Author or Object, founded or dependent on (tho' they succeeded) one another? Here again, our sagacious Reasoner was at a Fault; and with all his Freethinking could not distinguish between *one Religion's being built upon another*, and *one Religion's simply succeeding another*.

II. He now comes to the *Nature of Things*. The Reader sees how short he falls of his reckoning from *Fact*. But let him fairly make up his Accounts, and we won't differ with him about his way of Payment. We will readily receive his Deficiencies of *Fact*, in *Reason*. “And if we consider
“ (says he) the *Nature of Things*, we shall find that
“ it must be difficult, if not impossible, to introduce
“ amongst Men (who in all civilized Countries are
“ bred up in the Belief of some revealed Religion) a
“ revealed Religion wholly new, or such as has no
“ Reference to a preceding one: For that would be
“ to combat all Men in too many Respects, and
“ not to proceed on a sufficient number of Principles
“ necessary to be assented to by those, on
“ whom

“whom the first Impressions of a new Religion are
“proposed to be made^w.”

Here the poor Man's Head was full of the Theological Ideas of modern Times; where one Religion is maintained and propagated on the Destruction of all the rest. And *that indeed would be combating all Men in too many Respects*, without good Evidence in the Religion thus proposed. But had he had the least Knowledge of Antiquity, he would have known, that the *Gentile Religions* of those Times were founded on different Principles, and propagated on different Practices. No one of those numerous Religions ever pretended to accuse another of Falshood; and therefore was never itself in Danger of being so accused. They very amicably owned one another's Pretensions; and all a new Religion claimed, was to be let into Partnership with the rest, whose common Principle was to trade in Shares^x. Yet, according to this wonderful Rectifier of Prejudices, *it was difficult, if not impossible — it was combating all Men in too many respects. — It was not proceeding on a sufficient Number of Principles necessary to be assented to, &c.* But he can make *Men*, as well as *Religions*, change their *Natures* for the Service of a good Cause. It is the usual Way of him, and all his Fellows, to make the People, the gross Body of Mankind, run headlong into Religion without the least Inquiry after Evidence. But here we are told *it is very difficult, if not impossible*, to induce them to think well of a Religion that has not the most plausible Evidence for its Support: that the not giving them this, is *not proceeding on a sufficient Number of Principles, but combating all Men in too many Respects, &c.*

And this is all we can get out of him, *from the Nature of Things*. But as he has raised an Appe-

^w P. 23, 24.

^x See the first Vol. p. 279, & seq. Ed. 2.

tite which he knew not how to satisfy, I shall endeavour to assist his Weakness; and, from this *Nature of Things*, shew the Reader, 1. How the Religions of *Moses* and *JESUS* must necessarily suppose a Dependency on some preceding. 2. How the ancient Religions of *Paganism* must necessarily not suppose any such Dependency; and 3. How it came to pass, that the more *modern Impostures*, propagated since the coming of Christianity, imitated the *true* rather than *false* Religions of ancient Times, in the Pretence to Dependency.

I. The *Patriarchal*, the *Jewish*, and the *Christian* Religions, all professed coming from the only one God, the Creator of all Things. Now as the whole Race of Mankind must needs be the Object of the common Care of its Creator, all his Revelations, even to any one *Part* must be supposed to be ultimately directed to the Interest of the *whole*, consequently, every later Revelation must suppose the TRUTH of the preceding. Again, when several *successive* Revelations are given by him, some *less*, some *more* extensive, we must needs suppose them to be the Parts of *one entire Dispensation*; which, for Reasons best known to infinite Wisdom, are gradually enlarged and opened: consequently every later must not only suppose the *Truth* of every preceding Revelation, but likewise their mutual RELATION and DEPENDENCY. Hence we see, there may be weighty Reasons, why God from the Beginning should have been constantly giving a Succession of *Dispensations and Revelations*; as this Author, with a lewd Sneer, seems to have taken an ignorant Pleasure in observing. If therefore what we call true Revelation came from God, these Religions must needs be, and profess to be, dependent on one another.

Y P. 22.

II. Let

II. Let us see next how the Case stood in the ancient Pagan World. Their pretended Revelations were not from the one God, but all from local tutelary Deities; each of which was supposed to be employed in the Care of his own Country or People, and unconcerned in every other's Department. Consequently between earlier and later Revelations of this kind, there could be no more Relation or Dependency, than there was Opposition. But each stood on its own Foundation, single, independent, and original.

III. But when, by the Propagation of the *Gospel*, the Knowledge of the only one God was spread abroad over the whole Earth, an Impostor, who would now obtrude a new Religion on the World, must of necessity pretend to have received it from this only one God. But the Probability of his giving a Revelation *now*, being seen to depend greatly on his having given one *before*, our Impostor would be forced to own the *Truth* of those preceding Religions which professed to come from that God. And as the Credit of the new Religion was best advanced by its being thought a finishing Part of an incomplete Dispensation, he would, at the same time, *bottom* it on the preceding. Besides, as an Impostor must needs want that *strongest* Mark of a Divine Mission, the Power of Miracles, he could cover that want no otherwise than by a pretended Relation to a Religion which had well established itself by Miracles. And thus, in fact, *Mahomet* framed the Idea of his Imposture. He pretended his new Religion was the Completion of *Christianity*, as *Christianity* was of *Judaism*. For that Men not being to be won by the mild and gentle Invitations of *Jesus*, were now to be *compelled to enter in* by *Mahomet*. And so again, to complete the Imitation, this last and greatest Prophet, as his Followers

Followers believe him, is pretended to be foretold in the *New Testament*, as the *Messiah* was in the *Old*.

Thus we see, at length, this Observation of our Author's, from whence he endeavoured to deduce so discrediting a Likeness between all *false* Religion, and what we believe to be the *true*; we see, I say, what it comes to.

But he has yet another flagrant Mark of *Likeness*, in Reserve. And thus he goes on from *Discovery* to *Discovery*. — In building thus upon PROPHECY (says he) as a Principle, Jesus and his Apostles had the Concurrence of all Sects of Religion amongst the Pagans. Is it possible? Yes. For the Pagans universally built their Religion on DIVINATION^z. As much as to say, the People of *Amsterdam*, in building their Town-House upon Piles, had (in the Method of laying a Foundation) the Concurrence of all the Cities in *England*; who build theirs on Stone, or Clay, or Gravel. In the *Jewish* Writings there are Prophecies of a future and more perfect Dispensation; which, Jesus claiming to belong to him, his Religion was properly built upon PROPHECIES. The *Heathens* made Gods of their dead Benefactors, and then consulted their Shrines as Oracles; they inspected the Entrails of Beasts; they observed the Flight of Birds; they interpreted Dreams and uncommon *Phænomena*; and all these things they called DIVINATIONS. But what Likeness is there between these Things and *Prophecies*, the Prophecies on which Jesus founded his Religion? Just as much as between *Truth* and *Free-Thinking*. But he has found a Device to bring them related. 'Tis a Master-Piece; and the Reader should not be deprived of it. They [the Pagans] says he, learnt that Art [Divina-

^z *Grounds and Reasons*, &c. p. 27, 28.

tion] in Schools, or under Discipline, as the Jews did Propheying in the Schools and Colleges of the Prophets; where the learned Dodwell says the Candidates for Prophecy were taught the Rules of Divination practised by the Pagans, who were skilled therein, and in Possession of the Art long before them^a. This idle Whimsy concerning the Schools of the Prophets has been confuted already. But for the sake of so extraordinary an Argument, it deserves to be admitted for a moment, with all its Absurdities. The Reasoning then stands thus: *Divination* was an Art learnt in the Schools, so was *one kind of Prophecy*, or the *Jewish Art of Divination*: Those who learnt this *Jewish Art of Divination* were taught the Rules of *Pagan Divination*; THEREFORE *Pagan Divination* and ANOTHER kind of *Prophecy*, or the *Prediction of the Messiah*, were Things of the same kind. Incomparable Reasoner! and deservedly placed at the very head of modern Free-Thinking! But his Learning is equal to his Logic, and his Premise as true as his Conclusion; *The Pagans universally built their Religion on Divination*. I believe there are few School-boys, who could not tell him otherwise, and *that the Pagans universally built Divination on their Religion*. All that was ever built on *Divination* was now and then a Shrine or Temple. To return,

III.

But these Prejudices, concerning local tutelary Deities, which made the *Introduction* of a *Theocracy* so easy, occasioned as easy a *Defection* from the Laws of it.

1. For these tutelary Deities owning one another's Quality, there was always, amongst their proper Followers, a friendly Intercourse of mutual Honours,

^a P. 28.

tho' not always of mutual Worship. For at first each God was supposed to be so taken up with the Affairs of his own People, as to have little Leisure or Inclination to attend to those of others. And this Prejudice was the *first* Source of the *Jewish* Idolatry.

2. But the Pretensions of *all* these Gods being thus mutually acknowledged; and *some*, by the fortunate Circumstances of their Worshipers, risen into superior Fame, the *Rites* used in their Worship would be eagerly sought after, and imitated. And this was the *second* Source of *Jewish* Idolatry; as we see in the Erection of the Golden Calf, and the Fondness for all *Egyptian* Superstitions in general.

3. But of these tutelary Deities there being two Sorts, *Gentilitial* and *Local*, the one ambulatory, the other stationed; these latter were fixed to their Posts, a kind of *Heir-loom*, which they who conquered and possessed the Country, were obliged to maintain in their accustomed Honours. And whatever *Gentilitial* Gods a People might bring with them, yet the *Local* God was to have a necessary Share in the religious Worship of the new Comers. Nay it was thought Impiety even in Foreigners, while they sojourned only in a strange Country, not to pay it to the Gods of the Place. Thus *Sophocles* makes *Antigone* say to her Father, that a Stranger should worship and abhor those Things which are worshipped and abhorred in the City where he resides^b. *Celsus* assigns the Reason, because the several Parts of the World were, from the Beginning, distributed to several Powers, each of which

^b Τόλμα ξείνῳ

Ἐπὶ ξείνης, ὃ τλάμῳ, ὃ, τι

καὶ πόλις τέτροφεν ἄφρον

Ἀποσυγεῖν καὶ τὸ φίλον σέβει. *Æt. 1. Oedip. Colon.*

had

had his peculiar Allotment and Residence^c. It was in Opposition to this universal Principle of Paganism, that Moses thought fit to caution them in the following Words: *When the Lord thy God shall cut off the Nations from before thee, whither thou goest to possess them, and thou succeedest them and dwellest in their Land: Take heed to thyself that thou be not snared by following them, after that they be destroyed from before thee, and that thou ENQUIRE NOT AFTER THEIR GODS, saying, How did these Nations serve their Gods? even so will I do likewise^d.* And David alluding to it, makes his being unjustly driven into an idolatrous Land, the same as being forced to serve idolatrous Gods. For thus he expostulates with his Persecutor, “ Now therefore I pray thee let my Lord the King hear the Words of his Servant: If the Lord have stirred thee up against me, let him accept an Offering: But if they be the Children of Men, cursed be they before the Lord; for they have driven me out this Day from abiding in the Inheritance of the Lord, saying, Go serve other Gods^e.” To the same Principle Jeremiah likewise alludes in the following Words, *Therefore will I cast you out of this Land, into a Land that ye know not, neither ye nor your Fathers: and there shall ye serve other Gods Day and Night, where I will not shew you Favour^f.* Whereby is not meant that they should be forced, any otherwise than by the superstitious Dread of divine Vengeance for a slighted Worship: For at

^c — ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅτι, ὡς εἰκὸς, τὰ μέρη τῆς γῆς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἄλλα ἄλλοις ἐποπταῖς νεμεμημένα, καὶ κατὰ τινὰς ἐπικρατείας διειλημμένα, ταύτη καὶ διοικεῖται. καὶ δὴ τὰ παρ’ ἐκάστοις ὁρθῶς ἀν’ ἀλλήλοις ταύτη δρώμενα, ὅπη ἐκείνοις φίλον, παραλύειν ἢ εἶναι ὅσιον εἶναι τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς καὶ τόπους νενομισμένα. Orig. cont. Cels. lib. v. p. 247. See the Passage, from Plato, p. 230, 231.

^d DEUT. xii. 29, 30.

^e 1 SAM. xxvi. 19.

^f Chap. xvi. v. 13.

this Time civil Restraint in matters of Religion was very rare.

But the imaginary Vengeance that the tutelary God was supposed to take on those, who, inhabiting his Land, yet slighted his Worship, was at length taken in good earnest on the idolatrous *Cutbeans*, when they came to possess the Land of *Israel*. For the Almighty having, in Condescension to the Prejudices of the *Israelites*, assumed the Title of a *tutelary local* God, and chosen *Judea* for his peculiar Regency; it appeared but fit that he should, indeed, discharge the *imaginary* Function of a tutelary God, in order to distinguish himself from those Vanities, by some illustrious Display of Power, both to *Jews* and *Gentiles*. Therefore when so great a Portion of his chosen People had been led captive, and a Rabble of Pagans put into their Possessions; he sent Plagues amongst them, for their idolatrous *Profanation* of the Holy Land. Which Calamity their own Pagan Principles enabled them easily to account for. The Story is told in these Words:

“ And the King of *Assyria* brought Men from *Ba-*
“ *bylon*, and from *Cuthab*, and from *Ava*, and
“ from *Hamath*, and from *Sepharvaim*, and placed
“ them in the Cities of *Samaria*, instead of the
“ Children of *Israel*; and they possessed *Samaria*,
“ and dwelt in the Cities thereof. And so it was
“ at the Beginning of their dwelling there that they
“ feared not the Lord; therefore the Lord sent
“ Lions amongst them which slew some of them.
“ Wherefore they spake to the King of *Assyria*,
“ saying, The Nations which thou hast removed,
“ and placed in the Cities of *Samaria* know not the
“ Manner of the God of the Land: therefore he
“ hath sent Lions amongst them; and behold they
“ slay them, because they know not the Manner
“ of the God of the Land. Then the King of *As-*
“ *syria*

“ *syria* commanded, saying, Carry thither one of
“ the Priests — and let him teach them the Manner
“ of the God of the Land. — Then one of the Priests
“ came and dwelt in *Bethel*, and taught them how
“ they should fear the Lord. Howbeit every Na-
“ tion made Gods of their own — every Nation in
“ their Cities wherein they dwelt. — So these Na-
“ tions feared the Lord and served their graven
“ Images, both their Children and their Childrens
“ Children, as did their Fathers, so do they unto
“ this Day ^g. ”

And this was the true Reason why, when, after
Judea became Provincial to the Kings of *Persia*
and *Syria*, those Monarchs so frequently appointed
Sacrifices to be offered to the God of the Land at
Jerusalem, in behalf of themselves and Families.

Hence therefore the *third* Source of the *Jewish*
Idolatries. It was this superstitious Reverence to
local Deities within their own Departments, that
made them so devoted, while in *Egypt*, to the Gods
of that Country ; and when in Possession of their
own Land, to the *tutelary* Gods of *Canaan*.

But this Intercommunity of Worship, begun by
the Migration of People and Colonies from one
Country to another, grew more general, as those
Migrations became more frequent. ’Till at length
the *Frequency*, aided with many other concurrent
Causes (taken notice of in other Places) made the
Intercommunity universal. And this was the *last*
Source of *Jewish* Idolatries. This drew them in to
the Service of all the Gods they heard of, or could
imagine to receive good from ; such as those, espe-
cially, of every great and powerful Nation.

These Prejudices of Opinion, joined to all those
of Practice learnt in *Egypt*, were the true Cause of

^g 2 KINGS xvii. 24, & seq.

their so frequent Lapse into Idolatry. From whence it appears, that their Defection from the God of *Israel*, wicked and abominable as it was, never consisted in the rejecting him as a false God, or the Law of *Moses* as a false Religion, but only in joining *idolatrous Rites* and *foreign Worship* to those of the true God. Their Motive for the Idolatries of *Egypt* was inveterate Custom; for the Idolatries of *Canaan*, the prevailing Principle that the tutelary God of the Place should be worshipped by its Inhabitants; and for *all other Idolatries*, the vain Expectation of Good from the guardian Gods of famous and happy Nations.

That this was the whole of their Idolatry, is farther evident from the Accounts which the holy Prophets give us of it, in their Exprobrations to the People.

ISAIAH says, *To what Purpose is the Multitude of your Sacrifices unto me, saith the Lord: I am full of the Burnt-offerings of Rams, and the Fat of fed Beasts, &c.*^h To whom are these Words addressed? To those who, besides their numerous Immoralities, there reckoned up at large, delighted in idolatrous Worship in *Groves* and *high Places*. For the Denunciation is thus continued: *They shall be ashamed of the Oaks which ye have desired, and ye shall be confounded for the Gardens that ye have chosen*ⁱ. He describes them again in this Manner: *A People that provoketh me to Anger continually TO MY FACE, that sacrificeth in Gardens, and burneth Incense upon Altars of Brick*^k. Yet these, at the same Time, gloried so much in being the peculiar People of the Lord, that they said, *Stand by thyself, come not near to me, for I am holier than thou*^l.

^h Chap. i. v 11.ⁱ v 29.^k Chap. lxv. v 3.^l v 5.

JEREMIAH draws them in the very same Colours: *Though they say, The Lord liveth, surely they swear falsely^m, i. e. vainly, idolatrously. Why? The Reason is given soon after; they swore likewise by their Idols: How shall I pardon thee for this? thy Children have forsaken me, and sworn by them that are no Godsⁿ. Again, Will ye steal, murder, and commit Adultery, and swear falsely, and burn Incense unto Baal, and walk after other Gods that ye know not; and come and stand before me in this House, which is called by my Name, and say, We are delivered to do all these Abominations^o? And in another Place we find these Idolaters thus expostulating with the Prophet: Wherefore hath the Lord pronounced all this Evil against us? or what is our Iniquity, or what is our Sin that we have committed against the Lord our God^p? And the Prophet answering them in this Manner: Because your Fathers have forsaken me, saith the Lord, and walked after other Gods, and have served them, and have worshipped them, and have forsaken me, and have not kept my Law: And ye have done worse than your Fathers^q. But is it possible they could have been so exceeding stupid or impudent as to talk at this rate, had they ever renounced the Religion, or the God of their Forefathers?*

EZEKIEL, likewise, shews plainly that their Idolatries consisted in polluting the Religion of Moses with foreign Worship: “ Son of Man, these Men
“ have set up their Idols in their Heart, and put
“ the Stumbling-block of their Iniquity before their
“ Face: Shall I be enquired of at all by them?
“ Therefore speak unto them, and say unto them,
“ Thus saith the Lord God, Every Man of the House
“ of Israel that putteth up his Idols in his Heart,

^m Chap. v. § 2. ⁿ § 7. ^o Chap. vii. § 9, 10.

^p Chap. xvi. § 10. ^q § 11, 12.

“ and putteth the Stumbling-block of Iniquity before his Face, and *cometh to the Prophet*, I the Lord will answer him that cometh according to the Multitude of his Idols^r, &c. And again: *As for you, O House of Israel, Thus saith the Lord God, Go ye, serve ye every one his Idols, and hereafter also, if ye will not hearken unto me: but pollute ye my Holy Name no more with your Gifts and with your Idols^s.* In another Place the same Prophet giveth a terrible Instance of this horrid Mixture: “ They have committed Adultery, and Blood is in their Hands, and with their Idols have they committed Adultery, and have also caused their Sons, whom they bare unto me, to pass for them through the Fire to devour them. Moreover this they have done unto me: *they have defiled my Sanctuary in the same Day, and have profaned my Sabbaths. For when they had slain their Children to their Idols, then they came the same Day into my Sanctuary to profane it; and lo, thus have they done in the midst of mine House^t.*” These, and innumerable other Passages in the Prophets, to the same Purpose, evidently shew, that this Defection from the God of *Israel*, consisted not in a Rejection of him, or of his *Law*.

This appears still more evident from the following Considerations:

1. That, in the Course of their Idolatries, they abused the *Memorials of their own Dispensation* to superstitious Worship. Such as the *Brazen Serpent of Moses*; which, in the Time of their Kings, they worshipped and burnt Incense unto^v. And I greatly suspect they paid the same religious Honour to that Monument of twelve Stones, taken out of the Channel of *Jordan*, and pitched in *Gilgal* for a Me-

^r Chap. xiv. v 3, 4. ^s Chap. xx. v 39. ^t Chap. xxiii. v 37, — 39. ^v 2 KINGS xviii. 4.

memorial of their miraculous Passage^w. What induces me to think so, are the following Words of *Isaiab*:
 “ Draw near hither, ye Sons of the Sorcerers, the
 “ Seed of the Adulterer, and the Whore. Against
 “ whom do you sport yourselves?—enflaming your-
 “ selves with Idols under every green Tree, slaying
 “ the Children in the Valleys under the Cliffs of
 “ the Rocks? AMONGST THE SMOOTH STONES OF
 “ THE STREAM IS THY PORTION; they, they are
 “ thy Lot; EVEN TO THEM HAST THOU POURED
 “ A DRINK-OFFERING, thou hast offered a Meat-
 “ offering. Should I receive Comfort in these *?”

2. The *Israelites* were only prone to Idolatry in PROSPEROUS TIMES; and constantly returned to the God of their Fathers in ADVERSITY, as appears from their whole History. And, to leave them afterwards without Excuse, they were, more than once, warned against this Folly, before they entered into the Land of Blessings. “ And it shall be (says
 “ *Moses*) when the Lord thy God shall have brought
 “ thee into the Land which he swore unto thy Fa-
 “ thers, to *Abraham*, to *Isaac*, and to *Jacob*, to give
 “ thee, great and goodly Cities which thou build-
 “ dedst not, and Houses full of all good things
 “ which thou filledst not, and Wells digged which
 “ thou diggedst not, Vineyards and Olive-Trees
 “ which thou plantedst not, when thou shalt have
 “ eaten and be full; then beware lest thou forget
 “ the Lord which brought thee forth out of the Land
 “ of *Egypt* from the House of Bondage. Thou shalt
 “ fear the Lord thy God and serve him, and shalt
 “ swear by his Name. Ye shall not go after other
 “ Gods, of the Gods of the People which are round
 “ about you.” But *Moses* himself lived to see an
 Example of this Perversity, before they got Posses-

^w JOSH. iv. 3. 20, 21, 22. ^x Is. lvii. 3, & seq.

^y DEUT. vi. 10, & seq. and Chap. viii. & 11, & seq.

sion of the Land of Canaan: But Jeshurun (says he) waxed fat, and kicked: Thou art waxen fat, thou art grown thick, thou art covered with Fatness; then he forsook God which made him, and lightly esteemed the Rock of his Salvation^z. And the Prophet Hosea assures us, that the Day of Prosperity was the constant Season of their Idolatry; *Israel is an empty Vine, he bringeth forth Fruit unto himself*: ACCORDING TO THE MULTITUDE OF HIS FRUIT, HE HATH INCREASED THE ALTARS; ACCORDING TO THE GOODNESS OF HIS LAND THEY HAVE MADE GOODLY IMAGES^a. And again: *According to their Pasture so were they filled; they were filled, and their Heart was exalted: therefore have they forgotten me*^b. This, therefore, is a most clear Proof that their Defection from the God of *Israel* was not a Doubt of his Power, but a wanton Abuse of his Blessings. Had they questioned the Truth of his Law, their Behaviour had been just otherwise: They had stuck to it in Time of Prosperity; and left it in Adversity and Trouble. This the Deists would do well to consider.

3. All the Terms in which God's *Warnings* and *Exprobrations* against Idolatry are expressed, shew that their Idolatry was no Rejection of him. He will have no Fellowship or Communion with false Gods: that was the Point insisted on. And here let me observe that this seems to be the true Reason why, in the Warnings against idolatrous Gods, so little is remarked, except in very general Terms, concerning their Falseness, Impotency, and base Original. For their Truth or Power were never put in Competition with the God of *Israel's*. Again, Almost the only Terms used by God, to express the *Idolatries* of his People, are those of *Adultery* and

^z DEUT. xxxii. 15.
^y 6.

^a Chap. x. y 1.

^b Chap. xiii.

Whoredom. And his Repentment of their Idolatries, is in the perpetual Use of the same Metaphor; which shews that his Right over them was still confessed. Just as the Husband's is by an adulterous Wife amidst all her Pollutions with Strangers. Where it is to be observed, that though the *Jewish* Idolatry is so perpetually styled *Adultery*, yet the *Pagan*, I think, never is, though very often *Whoredom*. And this Distinction is plainly intimated in the following Words of *Ezekiel*: "How weak is
 " thine Heart, saith the Lord God, seeing thou
 " dost all these Things, the Work of an imperious
 " whorish Woman? In that thou buildest thine
 " eminent Place in the Head of every Way, and
 " makest *thine high Place* in every Street, and hast
 " not been as an Harlot (in that thou scornest Hire)
 " But as a Wife that committeth *Adultery*, which
 " taketh Strangers instead of her Husband^c."

However, thus much is confessed, that though, as we have shewn, the very worst of their Idolatry consisted only in mixing foreign Worship with that of the God of *Israel*; yet, in their mad Attention to these Abominations, the Worship of the true God was often extremely neglected, so as to be said to have been even *forsaken* by them; as where God, by the Prophet, says, *They have forsaken me, the Fountain of living Waters*^d. Though this was no more a rejecting God than the *Saint-Worship* of the Church of *Rome*; when, in the late ignorant Ages, the common Object of the People's private Devotion were their *tutelary* Saints.

The several principal Parts, therefore, of the *Israelitish* Idolatry were these,

^c Chap. xvi. v 30, 31, 32.

^d JER. ii. 13. But by what follows v 35. it appears that this was far from an Apostasy from God.

1. Worshipping the true God under an Image, such as the *golden Calves*, 1 KINGS xii. 28.
2. Worshipping him in Places forbid, as in Groves, 2 KINGS xviii. 22. Is. xxxvi. 7.
3. And by idolatrous Rites, such as cutting themselves with Knives, JER. xli. 5.
4. By profaning the House of God with idolatrous Images, JER. xxxii. 34.
5. By worshipping the true God and Idols together.
6. And lastly, by worshipping Idols alone, though not exclusive of the true God.

If the Reader would know what Use I intend to make of this Account of the *Jewish Idolatry*, to the main Question of my Work, I must crave his Patience till we come to the *last Proposition*. If he would know what other Use may be made of it, he must consider what hath been said above; and be farther pleased to observe, that it obviates the Objection of a sort of Men equally unskilled in sacred and profane Antiquity; who, from this Circumstance of the perpetual Defection of the *Jews* into Idolatry, would conclude that the Dispensation of God to them could never have been so illustrious as their History represents it. The Strength of which Objection rests on these two Suppositions, that their Idolatry consisted in renouncing the Law of *Moses*; and renouncing it as dissatisfied of its Truth. Both which Suppositions we have shewn to be false: The Neglect of the Law, during their most idolatrous Practice, being no other than their preferring impure *novel* Rites (which most strongly engage the Attention of a superstitious People) to *old* ones, whose Sanctity has no carnal Allurements. As to its Original from God, they never entertained the least doubt of it; or that that God was the Creator of the Universe. Indeed, in the Period
just

just preceding their Captivity, when the extraordinary Providence was gradually withdrawing from them (a Matter to be explained hereafter) they began to entertain Doubts concerning God's *farther* Regard to them, *as his chosen People*. But that nothing of this ever contributed to their Idolatry is plain from what we have shewn above, of its being a wanton Defection in the midst of Peace, Prosperity, and Abundance, the confessed Effects of the extraordinary Providence of the God of *Israel*, and of their constantly running back to him in Times of Difficulty and Distress.

It is true, that this State of the Case, which removes the infidel Objection, at the same Time discovers a most enormous Perversity in that People, which tho' convinced of the Truth of a Religion forbidding all Intercommunity, would yet so perpetually run a madding after foreign Worship. But let God be true, and every Man a Liar, as it is written, *That thou mightest be justified in thy Doings, and overcome when thou art judged!* However, would we but transport ourselves into these Times, and remember what has been said of that general Principle of *Intercommunity* of Worship; and how early and deeply the *Jews* had imbibed all the essential Superstitions of Paganism, we should find good Reason to make large Allowances.

But one thing more, before we leave this Subject, is too remarkable to be past over. As fond as the *Jews* were of borrowing their Neighbours' Gods, I do not find, by any Circumstance of ancient History, either profane or sacred, that their Neighbours were disposed to borrow theirs. Nay we are assured, by Holy Writ, that they did not. God, by the Prophet *Ezekiel*, addressing himself to the *Jews*, speaks on this wise: *And the contrary is in thee from other Women in thy WHOREDOMS,*

WHEREAS

WHEREAS NONE FOLLOWETH THEE TO COMMIT WHOREDOMS: *and in that thou givest a Reward, and no Reward is given to thee; therefore thou art contrary*^e. I have shewn, elsewhere, that, by this, is meant, that no Gentile Nation borrowed the *Jewish* Rites and Worship, to join them to their own. For as to Profelytes, or particular Men converted to the Worship of the true God, we find a prodigious Number in the Days of *David* and *Solomon*^f. So again, in the Prophet *Jeremiah*, HATH A NATION CHANGED THEIR GODS, WHICH ARE YET NO GODS? *But my People have changed their Glory for that which doth not profit*^g; *i. e.* Hath any of the Nations brought in the God of *Israel* into the Number of their idolatrous Gods, as the *Israelites* have brought in theirs? For that they frequently changed their tutelary Gods, one Idol for another, is notorious.

This then is remarkable. The two principal Reasons I suppose were these:

1. It was a thing well known to all the neighbouring Nations, that the God of *Israel* had an Abhorrence to all Community or Alliance with the Gods of the Gentiles. This *unsociable* Temper would deter those People (who all held him as a *tutelary* Deity of great Power) from ever bringing him into the Fellowship of their Country Gods. For, after such exprefs Declarations, they could not but suppose his Company would prove very troublesome and unauspicious. And in truth they had a signal Instance of it, to their Cost, which brings me to the second Reason,

2. The Devastation he brought upon the *Philistines*, while the *ARK* rested in their Quarters. For they having taken it from the *Israelites* in

^e Chap. xvi. v. 34.

^f 2 CHRON. ii. 17.

^g Chap. ii. v. 11.

Battle, carried it, as another *Palladium*^h, to *Ashdod*, and placed it in the Temple of their God *Dagon*; who passed two so ill Nights with this new Guest, that on the second Morning he was found with only his *fishy Stump left unto him*ⁱ, and this Disaster was followed with a desolating Plague. The People of *Ashdod*, who hitherto had intended to keep the *Ark* as one of their idol Protectors, now declare *it should not abide with them, for that the Hand of the God of Israel was sore upon them, and upon Dagon their God*^k. They sent it therefore to *Gath*, another of their Cities; and these having carried it about in a religious Procession^l, it made the same Havock there^m. It was then removed a third Time, with an Intent to send it to *Ekron*; but the Men of that City terrified with the two preceding Calamities refused to receive it, saying *they had brought the Ark of the God of Israel to slay them and their People*ⁿ. At length the *Philistines* were brought to understand, that it was the best Course to send it back to its Owners; which they did with great Honour; and with Gifts and Trespass-Offerings to appease the offended Divinity^o. And from this Time we

^h For this was the only use the Pagans ever thought of making of an Enemy's God, when they had stolen it, or taken it away by Force. *Apion* had spoken of one *Zabidus* an *Idumean*, who, when the *Jews* were warring against his Countrymen, made a Bargain with the Enemy to deliver *Apollo*, one of their tutelary Gods, into their Hands; and *Josephus*, when he comes to confute this idle Tale, takes it for granted that the only supposed Cause of such pretended Traffic was to gain a new tutelary Deity, and, on this, founds his Argument against *Apion*: *How then, says he, can Apion persist in accusing us of not having Gods in common with others, when our Forefathers so easily believed Apollo was coming into their Service?* Τι δ' ἡμῶν ἐτι κατήγορεῖ τὸ μὴ κοινὰς ἔχειν τοῖς ἄλλοις θεῶς, εἰ ῥαδίως ἔτως ἐπέιοθ' ἡσαν οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν, ἥξειν τ' Ἀπόλλωνα πρὸς αὐτούς. Vol. ii. p. 478.

ⁱ 1 SAM. v. 4, 5.

^k ψ 7.

^l ψ 9.

^m ψ 9.

^o ψ 10.

^o Chap. vi. ψ 3.

hear

hear no more of the Attempts of the Gentile Nations to join any Part of the *Jewish* Worship to their own. But they considered the God of *Israel* as a tutelary Deity *absolutely unsociable*, who would have nothing to do with any but *that People*, or with such particular Men as would worship him *alone*: And therefore, in this respect, different from *all other tutelary* Gods; each of which was willing to live in Community with all the rest. This, the Historian *Josephus* understood to be their Sentiment, when he makes the *Midianitish* Women address the young Men of *Israel* in this manner: *Nor ought you to be blamed for honouring those Gods which belong to the Country where you sojourn* ^p. *Besides, our Gods are common to all the Nations, yours to none of them* ^q.

And thus the Matter rested, till occasion requiring that God should vindicate his Property in that Country which he had chosen for his peculiar Residence as a tutelary Deity; he then drove the Pagan Inhabitants of *Samaria* into his Worship, just as he had driven the *Philistines* from it: And in both Cases hath afforded to his Servants the most illustrious Proofs of Divine Wisdom, in his manner of conducting this Oeconomy to its full Completion.

^p See what has been said above concerning this imaginary Obligation.

^q Μέμψατο δ' εἰς αὐτοὺς, εἰ γὰρ εἰς ἡν ἀφίχθε τὰς ἰδίους αὐτῆς Θεοὺς προσετίθειτε· καὶ ταῦτα, ὅτι μὴ ἡμετέρων κοινῶν ὄντων πρὸς ἀπαντας, ἔδ' ὑμεῖς πρὸς μὴδέναν ἑτέρα τυγχάνοντες. *Antiq. Jud.* l. iv. c. 6. Sect. 8.

SECT.

S E C T. III.

HAVING thus shewn the *Nature* of this *Theocracy*, and the *attendant Circumstances* of its Erection; our next Enquiry will be concerning its DURATION.

Most Writers suppose it to have ended with the *Judges*; but scarce any bring it lower than the *Captivity*. On the contrary, I hold that, in strict Truth and Propriety, it ended not 'till the *Coming of Christ*.

I. That it ended not with the *Judges* appears evident for these Reasons:

1. Tho' indeed the People's Design, in their Clamours for a King, was to have a Monarchy like that of their idolatrous Neighbours; and is so represented by God himself, in his Reproof of their Impiety^r; yet in Compassion to their Blindness, he, in this Instance, as in many others, indulged them in their Prejudices, without exposing them to the fatal Consequence of their Demand; which, if complied with, in the Sense they made it, had been the withdrawing his extraordinary Protection from them, at a Juncture when they could not support themselves without it. He therefore gave them a King; but such an one as was only his *Viceroy* or *Deputy*; who therefore was not left to the People's Election, but chosen by himself: The only Difference between God's Appointment of the *Judges* and *Saul* being this, that *they* were chosen by internal Influence; *he*, by Lots, or external Designation.

2. This King had an *unlimited executive Power*; as God's *Viceroy* must needs have.

1 SAM. viii. 7.

3. He

3. He had *no Legislative Power* ; which no *Viceroy* could have.

4. He was placed and displaced by God at Pleasure : of which, as *Viceroy*, we see the perfect Fiteness ; but as *Sovereign*, by the People's Choice, it is not easy to be accounted for ; because God never infringed the natural Rights of this People, as appears by his leaving it, at first, to their free Choice whether they would have *himself* for King.

5. The very same Punishment was ordained for *cursing the King* as for *blaspheming God*, namely, *stoning to Death* ; and the Reason is intimated in these Words of *Abishai* to *David*, *Shall not Shimei be put to death for this, because he cursed the LORD's ANOINTED^s?* the common Title of the Kings of *Israel* and *Judah*, and plainly denoting their Office of *Viceroyalty*.

6. This is necessarily inferred to be their true Office by the Throne and Kingdom of *Judea's* being all along, under the Kings, expressly declared to be *God's Throne* and *God's Kingdom*. Thus, in the first Book of *Chronicles*, it is said that *Solomon sat on the THRONE OF THE LORD as King, instead of David his Father^t*. And the Queen of *Sheba*, who visited *Solomon*, to be instructed in his Wisdom, and doubtless had been informed by him of the true Nature of his Kingdom, compliments him in these Words : *Blessed be the Lord thy God, which delighted in thee to set thee on HIS THRONE TO BE KING FOR THE LORD THY GOD^v* : The precise Description of a *Viceroy*. In like manner *Abijah* speaks to the House of *Israel*, on their Defection from *Rehoboam* : *And now ye think to withstand the KINGDOM OF THE LORD IN THE HANDS of the Sons of David^w*. And, to the same Purpose, *Nehemiah* : *Neither have*

^s 2 SAM. xix. 21.
ix. 8.

^t Chap. xxix. § 23.

^v 2 CHRON.

^w 2 CHRON. xiii. 8.

our Kings, our Princes, our Priests, nor our Fathers kept thy Law, nor hearkened unto thy Commandments, and thy Testimonies wherewith thou didst testify against them. For they have not served thee in THEIR KINGDOM^x. The Sense, I think, requires that the *Septuagint* Reading should be here preferred, which says, ΕΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ, ΣΟΥ, IN THY KINGDOM. And this the *Syriac* and *Arabic* Versions follow. As *Judea* is always called his *Kingdom*, so he is always called the *King of the Jews*. Thus the Psalmist: *Thine Altars, O Lord of Hosts, my KING and my God^y*. And again: *Let Israel rejoice in him that made him: let the Children of Zion be joyful in their KING^z*. And thus the Prophet *Jeremiah*: *The KING, whose Name is the Lord of Hosts^a*.

7. The penal Laws against Idolatry were still in Force during their *Kings*; and put in Execution by their best Rulers, and even by Men *inspired*. Which, alone, is a Demonstration of the Subsistence of the *Theocracy*; because such Laws are absolutely unjust under every other Form of Government.

As to the Title of *King* given to these Rulers, this will have small Weight with those who reflect that *Moses* likewise, who was surely no more than God's *Deputy*, is called *King*: *Moses commanded us a Law; even the Inheritance of the Congregation of Jacob*. And he was KING in *Jeshurun*, when the *Heads of the People*, and the *Tribes of Israel* were gathered together^b.

Let us now see what the celebrated M. *Le Clerc* says in Defense of the contrary Opinion, which supposes the *Theocracy* to have ended with the *Judges*. *Father Simon* of the *Oratory* had said, that the *Republic of the Hebrews* never acknowledged any other Chief than God alone, who continued to govern in

^x Chap. ix. v 35.

^y PSAL. lxxxiv. 3.

^z PSAL. cxlix. 2.

^a JER. li. 57.

^b DEUT. xxxiii. 4 and 5.

that Quality, even during the Time in which it was subject to Kings^c. This was enough to make his learned Adversary take the other Side of the Question : Who being piqued at *Simon's* contemptuous Slight of his Offer of Assistance in the Project for a new *Polyglott*, revenged himself in those licentious^d Letters, intituled, *Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande*, where his only Business was to pick a Quarrel. He therefore maintains against *Simon*, That the Theocracy ceased on establishing the Throne in the Race of David^e. What he has of Argument to support his Opinion is but little ; and may be summed up in this Observation, That God did not personally interfere with his Directions, nor discharge the Functions of a Magistrate after the Establishment of the Kings as he had done before^f. Certainly he did not, and with very good Reason. For in what consisted the Office of a Viceroy but

^c La Republique des Hebreux differre en cela de tous les autres états du monde, qu'elle n'a jamais reconnu pour chef que Dieu seul, qui a continué de la gouverner en cette qualité dans les tems mêmes qu'elle a été soumise à des rois. *Histoire Crit. de Vieux Test.* p 15. Ed. Rotterd. 1685.

^d I call them licentious, principally, for the extravagant Reasonings concerning the Authority of the *Pentateuch*, and the Divine Inspiration of Scripture. The first he retracted when the Spirit of Contradiction had given way to better Principles ; the other (which he had not offered as by the Author of the Letters) he never, that I know of, made any Satisfaction for, to Religion.

^e Il paroît au contraire par l'Ecriture, que Dieu n'a gouverné la republique des Hebreux, en qualité de chef politique, que pendant qu'ils n'avoient point de rois, & peut-être au commencement que les rois furent etablis, avant que la famille de David fut affermie sur le trône d'Israel. *Sentimens*, &c. p. 78.

^f — Pendant tout ce tems-la, Dieu fit les fonctions de roi. Il jugeoit des affaires — il repondoit par l'oracle — il regloit la marche de l'armée — il envoyoit même quelquefois un ange — On n'étoit obligé d'obeir aveuglement, qu'aux seuls ordres de Dieu. Mais lors qu'il y eut des rois en Israel, & que le royaume fut attaché à la famille de David, les rois furent maîtres absolus, & Dieu cessa de faire leurs fonctions. p. 78, 79.

to

to discharge those Functions for his *Principal*? He had indeed been a mere Cipher, had God still governed immediately as before. Mr. *Le Clerc* could own that God acted by the Ministry of the Judges^g. If then the Function could be discharged by *Deputation*, why might it not be done by *Kings* as well as *Judges*? The Difference is only from *less* to *more*, and from *occasional* to *constant*. No, says he, the Cession was in Consequence of his own Declaration to *Samuel*: *For they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not reign over them*^h. This only declares the Sense God had of their mutinous Request; but does not at all imply that he gave way to their Rebellion. For who, from the like Words (which express so natural a Resentment of an open Mutiny) would infer in the Case of any other Monarch, that he thereupon stepped down from his Throne, and suffered an Usurper to seize his Place? This the Reader sees was poor Reasoning. But luckily for his Reputation, he had an Adversary that reasoned worse. However he saw thus much into *Le Clerc's* Cavil, as to reply, *That all he had said was quite beside the Purpose, for that the Thing to be proved was, that, after the Establishment of the Kings, God was no longer the civil Chief*ⁱ. On which *Le Clerc* thus insults him: *As much as to say, that, in order to prove God was no longer Chief of the Hebrews after the Election of a*

^g — au lieu qu'auparavant Dieu lui-même le faisoit, par le ministère des Juges, qu'il suscitoit de temps en temps au milieu d'Israël. *Def. des Sent.* p. 121.

^h — C'est pour cela que Dieu dit à Samuel, lors qu'Israël voulut avoir un roi pour le juger à la manière de toutes les nations; ce n'est pas toi qu'ils ont rejeté, mais moi, afin que je ne regne point sur eux, 1 SAM. viii. 7.

ⁱ Je passe sous silence le long discours de Mr. le Clerc touchant le pouvoir de Dieu sur les Israélites avant l'établissement des rois, d'où il prétend prouver que Dieu pendant tout ce temps-la fit la

King, it is beside the Purpose to shew, he never afterwards discharged the Functions of a Chief of the Republic. It is thus this great Genius happily unravels Matters, and discovers, in an Instant, what is, and what is not to the Purpose^k. Whether Simon indeed knew why Le Clerc's Objection was nothing to the Purpose, is to be left to God and his own Conscience, for he gives us no Reasons for the Censure he passes on it: But that it was indeed nothing to the Purpose, is most evident, if this Proposition be true, "That a King does not cease to be King, when he puts in a Viceroy who executes the regal Office by Deputation."

But he returns to the Charge in his *Defense of the Sentiments*: "The Israelites did not reject God as Protector, but as civil Chief, as I observed before. They would have a King who should determine sovereignly, and command their Armies. Which, before this, God himself did, by the Ministry of the Judges, whom he raised up, from Time to Time, from the Midst of Israel. In this Sense we must understand absolutely the Words of God in Samuel, that I should not reign over them^l." It is indeed strange, that, after writing two Books, he should still insist on so foolish a Paralogism, that God's giving up his Of-

fonction de roi. Tout cela est hors de propos, puis qu'il s'agit de prouver qu'après ces temps-la Dieu n'a plus été leur chef: & c'est ce qu'on ne prouvera jamais. *Reponse aux Sentimens de quelques Theol. de Hol.* p. 55.

^k — C'est à dire que pour prouver que Dieu n'a pas été chef des Hebreux, après l'élection des rois, il est hors de propos de prouver qu'il n'a plus fait les fonctions de chef de la republique. C'est ainsi que ce grand genie debrouille heureusement les matieres, & decouvre d'abord ce qui est hors de propos, de ce qui ne l'est pas. *Defense des Sentimens*, p. 120.

^l Les Israëlites ne rejetterent pas Dieu comme protecteur, mais comme chef politique, ainsi que je l'ai marqué. Ils voulurent

fice

fice of civil Chief, was a necessary Consequence of the People's *demanding* it. For, that they did demand it, I own, to be evident from his Words to *Samuel*. Let us consider then this whole Matter a little more attentively.

Samuel (and I desire the Deists would take notice of it) had now, by a painful Administration of Affairs, restored the Purity of Religion, and rescued his Nation from the Power of the *Philistines*, and their other hostile Neighbours; against whom they were utterly unable to make head when he entered upon the public Ministration^m. At this very Time, the People, debauched, as usual, by Power and Prosperity, took the Pretence of the corrupt Conduct of the Prophet's two Sonsⁿ, to go in a tumultuous Manner and demand a King. But the secret Spring of their Rebellion was the Ambition of their Leaders; who could live no longer without the Splendor of a regal Court and Household;

avoir un roi qui les jugeat souverainement, & qui commandât leurs armées, au lieu qu'auparavant Dieu lui-même le faisoit, par le ministère des juges, qu'il suscitoit de temps en temps au milieu d'Israel. — En ce sens il faut entendre absolument les paroles de Dieu dans Samuël, *afin que je ne regne point sur eux*, p. 121.

^m *Spencer* seems here to have fallen into a Contradiction. In his Account of the *Effects* of the People's Demand, he observes: "Nec in Deum solum, sed & ejus ministrum *Samuelem*, se ingratos præbuerunt: nam & eum rejecerunt, qui collapsam morum & religionis disciplinam, abjectis idolorum sordibus, instaurâset, judicis æquissimi partes implevisset, & eo Philisthæos & alias e viciniâ gentes adduxisset, quod ne hiscere auderent, cum *Samuel* rei communi præficeretur." p. 243. Vol. i. Yet in his Account of the *Causes*, he assigns this amongst the chief: "Ingens belli moles eorum cervicibus impendere videbatur, & credebant Israelitæ res suas loco tutiori futuras, modo regis fidei & curæ mandarentur." p. 242. Now as his Account of *Samuel's* Administration is true, this could hardly have been amongst the impellent *Causes*.

ⁿ 1 SAM. viii. 5.

Give me (say they, as the Prophet *Hosea* makes them speak) *a King and Princes*^o; where every one of them might shine a distinguished Officer of State. They could get nothing, when their Affairs led them to their Judges poor Residence, in the *Schools of the Prophets*, but the GIFT of the *Holy Spirit*^p: which a Courtier, I suppose, would not prize even at the rate of *Simon Magus*, or think it worth the bribing for with a Piece of Money. This it was, and only this, that made their Demand criminal. For the chusing *Regal* rather than *Aristocratic* Viceroys was a Thing plainly indulged to them by the Law of *Moses*, in the following Admonition: *When thou art come unto the Land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shalt possess it, and shalt dwell therein, and shalt say, I will set a King over me, like as all the Nations that are about me: Thou shalt in any wise set him King over thee whom the LORD THY GOD SHALL CHOOSE: one from amongst thy Brethren shalt thou set King over thee: Thou mayest not set a Stranger over thee which is not thy Brother*^q. The plain Meaning of which Caution is, that they should take care, when they demanded a King, that they thought of none but such a one as was to be God's *Deputy*. As therefore Court-Ambition was only in the wicked View of these Malecontents, and no *foolish Fears* for the State, or Hopes of bettering the public Administration, it is evident to all acquainted with the Genius of this Time and People, that Compliance with their Demand must have ended in the utter Destruction of the *Mosaical Religion* as well as *Law*. But it was God's Purpose to keep them separate, in order to preserve the Memory of himself amidst an idolatrous World. We must needs conclude, then,

^o Chap. xiii. v 10.^p 1 SAM. x. 10. and Chap. xix.^q DEUT. xvii. 14, 15.

that

that he would not give way to their rebellious Demand.

And what we conclude from the *Reason* of the thing, the *History* of this Transaction clearly confirms. For now Scripture having informed us how God granted this People a *King*; to shew us, that he had not cast off the Government, but only transferred the immediate Administration to a Deputy, and consequently that *their King* was *his Viceroy*; it tells us, next, how he was pleased to bring them to *Repentance* in an extraordinary Way; the gracious Method he commonly employed when he intended to *Pardon*. *Samuel* assembled the People^r; and, to convince them of their Crime in demanding a King, called down the present Vengeance of their offended God, in a Storm of *Thunder and Rain* at the Time of *Wheat-harvest*^s. This impendent Desolation brings them to a Sense of their Folly, and they implore Pardon and Forgiveness: “ And all the
“ People said unto *Samuel*, Pray for thy Servants
“ unto the Lord thy God, that we die not: for
“ we have *added* unto all our Sins *this Evil*, to ask
“ *us a King*. And *Samuel* said unto the People,
“ Fear not: (ye have done all this Wickedness:
“ yet turn not aside from following the Lord, but serve
“ the Lord with all your Heart; and turn ye not
“ aside: for then should you go after vain Things,
“ which cannot profit nor deliver, for they are vain)
“ For the Lord will not forsake his People, for his
“ great Name’s sake: because it hath pleased the
“ Lord to make you his People^t.” Here, we see, they repent, are pardoned, and received again into Grace. They are ready to give up their King, and yet the regal Power is confirmed. The necessary Conclusion of all this is that their King was *first given*, and, *now*, at least, *received* as God’s Deputy.

^r 1 SAM. xii.^s 1 SAM. xii. 17, 18.^t y 19, & seq.

But *Father Simon* is at length provoked into a Reason, and that no weak one. God, he observes, kept the Election of their King in his own Hands^v. But *this, Le Clerc* says, *proves nothing*. How so? *Because, according to this Reasoning, we should be obliged to say that God oftener discharged the Functions of civil Chief in the idolatrous Realm of the ten Tribes than in that of Judah: for that was Elective, this Hereditary^w*. And what if we do, where is the Harm of it? The two Kingdoms made up but one Republic; of which God as Head, governed by two Viceroyes. And if he oftener acted immediately in the Kingdom of *Israel*, there was an evident Reason; its Inhabitants were more given to idolatrous Worship, and more needed the Frequency of an extraordinary Restraint. And in effect we find he did much interfere in other Instances, as well as in the Election of their Kings.

Thus the Dispute ended; and, for farther Satisfaction, *Le Clerc* refers us to a Book of *Spencer's*, written professedly upon this very Subject^x. It is his Tract *De Theocratia Judaica*. What is to be found there, besides the Arguments *Le Clerc* bor-

^v Et une preuve même qu'il ne cessoit pas d'être leur chef par cette election, c'est qu'il s'en rend le maître. *Reponse aux Sentimens*, p. 55.

^w Pour ce que dit M. Simon que Dieu se rend maître de l'élection des Rois, il ne s'ensuit nullement qu'il continuât d'être pour cela chef politique de la republique d'Israël; puisque si cela étoit, il faudroit dire que Dieu faisoit beaucoup plus souvent les fonctions de chef de l'état dans le royaume Idolatre des dix tribus, que dans celui de Juda. Car ce dernière royaume étoit hereditaire, & étoit possédé par la maison de David, sans qu'il fût besoin d'aucune election, au lieu qu'il se fit plusieurs elections dans celui des dix tribus. *Defense des Sentimens*, p. 121, 122.

^x Il n'est pas necessaire que je m'arrête d'avantage à cela, après ce qu'en a dit le savant *Spencer* dans un traité qu'il a fait expres sur cette matiere. *Lib. 1. de Legg. Heb. Ritual. Defense des Sent.* p. 122.

rowed from it, and which have been considered already, I shall now, with some Reluctancy, inform the Reader.

This Treatise is by no Means in the Number of those on which *Spencer* raised his Reputation. He goes on a wrong Hypothesis; he uses weak Arguments; and he is confused and inconsistent in his Assertions.

1. He thinks the *Theocracy* was established by *Degrees*^y, and abrogated by *Degrees*^z. A Conceit highly absurd as God was Legislator. He thinks the first Step to its Introduction was the Delivery at the Red Sea^a; and the first Step to its Abolition, the *Israelites* Demand of a King^b: That it was more impaired when *Saul* and *David* got Possession of the Throne^c: That it approached much nearer its End when it became hereditary, under *Solomon*^d: and yet, for all this, that some obscure Footsteps of it remained even to the Time of CHRIST^e.

^y — Neminem in sacris literis vel mediocriter versatum latere potest *Theocratiam* in ipso rerum Israeliticarum exordio aliquatenus obtinuisse, ad *ἀρχὴν* autem non nisi gradatim & post legem in Sinai datam pervenisse. *Vol. i. p. 239.*

^z Cum autem regiminis hujus, non simul & semel, sed per gradus quosdam, jacturam fecerint, placet hic veritatis fugientis vestigia gradatim premere. *Id. ib.*

^a Gradum primum ad potestatem regiam obtinendam fecisse videtur Deus, cum gentem Israeliticam insigni illo potentiae & bonitatis suae documento (*Ægyptiorum* in Mari Rubro submerfione) sibi devinxisset. *Id. ib.*

^b Primo itaque ad certum affirmo, quod *Israelitæ*, regem sibi dari postulantes, gradum primum ad imperii hujus desideratissimi ruinam fecisse videantur. *Id. ib.*

^c Dei regimen multo magis imminutum est, cum Deus *Saulem* & *Davidem* ad rerum arbitrium evocasset. *p. 240.*

^d Salomone rerum potito, *Theocratia* multo vicinior, *ἡ Θεοκρατία* non immerito censeatur.

^e *Judæi* *Theocratiae* veteris indicia & vestigia quaedam obscuriora, ad extrema usque politicae suae tempora retinere — ipso Domini nostri seculo, *Hierosolyma civitas magni regis* audit. *Ib.*

2. In his Arguments for the *Abolition* of the *Theocracy*, instead of employing the great Principles of Civil Policy, the only means of determining the Question with Certainty, he insists much on the Difuse of *Urim* and *Thummim*, &c. which *Le Clerc* borrowed from him, and has been already considered. He brings the *Despotic* Power of the Kings^f, as another Argument: which, I think, proves just the contrary. For were these Kings the Viceroys of God, whose Power was *despotic*, their Power must necessarily be so too; not so, if Monarchs in their own Right.

3. Though, as we observed, *Spencer*, in the *second Section of the fourth Chapter*, supposes a gradual Decay of the *Theocracy*; and that even some obscure Footsteps of it remained to the Time of CHRIST; yet, in the following *Section*, he, all the Way, argues upon the Supposition of an *absolute* and entire Abrogation by the Establishment of the Kings^g. To proceed,

II. That the *Theocracy* continued, or, more properly, was revived after the Return from the *Captivity*, is evident from this express Declaration of the Almighty, by the Prophet *Haggai*: *Yet now be strong, O Zerubbabel, saith the Lord, and be strong, O Joshua, Son of Josedeck the high Priest, and be strong, all ye People of the Land, saith the Lord, and work: for I am with you, saith the Lord of Hosts; ACCORDING TO THE WORD THAT I COVENANTED WITH YOU WHEN YOU CAME OUT OF EGYPT, SO MY SPIRIT REMAINETH AMONGST YOU: fear ye not*^h. What was that Covenant? That *Israel*

^f — adeo ut hinc constet eos se pro regibus gessisse, & potestatem arbitrariam exercuisse. *Ib.*

^g — Regiminis hujus mutati vel abrogati causa principalis — De regiminis hujus abrogati effectu vel eventu breviter differendum est — &c. p. 241, — 243.

^h Chap. ii. v. 4, 5.

should be his People, and he their God and *King*. Therefore it cannot mean, *barely*, that he would be their God, and they should be his People; for this was but *Part* of the Covenant. Nor can it mean that they should be conducted by an extraordinary Providence, as at their coming out of *Egypt*, and during the first Periods of the Theocracy; for this was but the *Effects* of the Covenant: and besides, we know that that Dispensation of Providence soon ceased after the Re-establishment. The Meaning therefore is, that he would be their *King* as well as God. Yet at the same Time, when this *Theocracy* was restored, it was both *fit* on Account of its Dignity, and *necessary* for the People's Assurance, that it should be attended with some unusual Display of divine Favour. Accordingly Prophets were raised up; and an extraordinary Providence, for some short Time, administered, as appears from many Places in those Prophetsⁱ.

III. That the Theocracy continued even to the coming of CHRIST, I thus prove:

1. Whenever it was *abrogated*, it must needs be done in the same solemn Manner in which it was *established*; so that the one might be as well known as the other: because it was of the highest Importance to a People, so strictly bound to Obedience, not to be mistaken concerning the Power under which they lived. Natural Equity requires it as a necessary Condition in the imposing and abrogating all civil Laws and Institutions whatsoever. Now the Theocracy having *never* been *thus* abolished, we conclude it was always subsisting.

2. Nor, indeed, could it at any Time have been abolished without dissolving the whole Frame of the Republic; all the Laws of it, whether as to their

ⁱ HAG. i. 6—11. Chap. ii. v. 16—19. ZECH. viii. 12. MAL. iii. 10, 11.

Equity, Force, or Fitness, as well as the whole Ritual of Worship, respecting, and referring to God as *civil Governour*. But the Institution suffered not the least Change in any of its Parts, from the Time of its Establishment by *Moses*, to its Dissolution by JESUS CHRIST, either by *Addition, Correction, or Abrogation*. Consequently the *Theocracy* was existing throughout that whole Period. Nothing being more absurd than to suppose that *national Laws*, all made in Reference to the *Form of Government*, should remain unvariable while the Government itself was changed. For what the Author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* says of the PRIEST (in a Constitution where the two Societies were incorporated) must be equally true of the KING. THE PRIESTHOOD (says he) BEING CHANGED, THERE IS MADE ALSO OF NECESSITY A CHANGE OF THE LAW^k.

3. And now it was that JESUS, who is here spoken of as making this Change in Quality of *Priest*, made it likewise in Quality of *King*. For, as we learn from the History of his Ministry, he came to succeed *immediately*, as Heir of God, in his Father's Kingdom. But there was no Interregnum. God *delivered him up* the Kingdom in which he was then in Possession. Consequently the *Theocracy* continued till the coming of *Christ*.

And this *Abolition* of the *Jewish Theocracy* by the *Son of God*, I take to be the *true Completion* of that famous Prophecy of *Jacob*, of which so much hath been written and disputed. THE SCEPTRE SHALL NOT DEPART FROM JUDAH, NOR A LAWGIVER FROM BETWEEN HIS FEET, UNTIL SHILOH COME^l, i. e. the *Theocracy* shall continue over the *Jews*^m

^k Chap. vii. § 12.

^l GEN. xlix. 10.

^m Who took their Name from the Tribe of *Juda*, the rest being incorporated with that Tribe, or extinguished in Captivity.

until *Christ* come to take Possession of his Father's Kingdom; for there was never any *Lawgiver*ⁿ, in *Judah*, but GOD by the Ministry of *Moses*, until the Coming of his SON. Thus we see this noble Prophecy, of the Advent of the MESSIAH, contains a matter of vastly greater Dignity in itself, and of vastly greater moment for the Establishment of *Christianity*, than could arise from any perplexed Question about the Reign of the *Asmonean* Princes, or the Continuance of the Power of Life and Death amongst a tributary People. For, in predicting the *Abolition* of the *Law*, it supplies us with a new and excellent Argument for the Conversion of the *Jewish* People, fatally persuaded of its perpetual Obligation.

The Reasons of my being so particular concerning the Duration of the *Theocracy* are various, and will be seen as occasion offers. Only the Reader may here take notice, that it was necessary for the present Purpose, to shew its Continuance throughout the whole Duration of the Republic, in order to vindicate the Justice of those Laws all along in Force for the Punishment of idolatrous Worship.

S E C T. IV.

THUS far as to the *Nature* and *Duration* of the *Mosaic* Republic. Let us now see what *peculiar Consequences* necessarily attended the Administration of such a Form of Government.

ⁿ *Mbhokek*, *Legislator*, aut *Legis interpres*. But the first is its original and proper Signification. And thus *Isaiab* [Chap. xxxiii. v 22.] "The Lord is our *Judge*, the Lord is our *LAWGIVER*" [*Mbhokekenou*] the Lord is our *King*, he will save us." Where the Word *Mbhokek* is used in its proper Signification of *Lawgiver*; the other Sense of Dispenser or Interpreter of the Law being contained in the Titles of *Judge* and *King*.

One necessary Consequence was an EXTRAORDINARY PROVIDENCE. For the Affairs of a People under a Theocracy, being administered by God as *King*; and his peculiar and immediate Administration in human Affairs being what we call an *extraordinary Providence*, it follows that an *extraordinary Providence* must needs be exercised over such a People. My meaning is, that if the *Jews* were really under a *Theocracy* they were really under an *extraordinary Providence*. And if a Theocracy was only pretended, yet an extraordinary Providence must necessarily be pretended likewise. In a word, they must be either both true or both false, but still inseparable^o.

^o The thing here asserted has been misunderstood, as contradicting what I afterwards observe concerning the gradual Decay and total Extinction of the *extraordinary Providence*, while the *Theocracy* yet existed. But when I say an *extraordinary Providence* was one necessary Consequence of a *Theocracy*, I must needs mean that it was so in its original Constitution, and in the established Nature of Things: Not that in this, which was matter of Compact, the contravening Acts of one Party might not make a *Separation*. For as this *extraordinary Providence* was, besides, a Reward for Obedience to the Theocracy, it became subject to a Forfeiture by Disobedience and Rebellion, tho' Subjection to the Government still continued. To illustrate this by a domestic Instance: A Voice in the supreme Council of the Kingdom is the necessary Consequence of an *English* Barony; yet they may be separated by a judicial Sentence; and actually have been so, as in the Case of the famous Lord *Bacon*, who was deprived of his Seat in the House of Lords, and yet held his Barony. This was the specific Punishment of the rebellious *Israelites*. They were deprived of the *extraordinary Providence*; and yet held subject to the *Theocracy*, as appears from the Sentence pronounced upon them by the Mouth of the Prophet *Ezekiel*: — “Ye pollute yourselves with your Idols even unto this Day: and shall I be enquired of by you, O House of *Israel*? As I live, saith the Lord God, I will not be enquired of by you. And that which cometh into your Mind shall not be at all, that ye say, we will be as the Heathen, as the Families of the Countries to serve Wood and Stone. As I live, saith the Lord, with a mighty Hand,

This

This leads me to observe the unnecessary Trouble and Hazard to which *Moses* here exposed himself, if his Mission were only pretended. Had he done no more than the rest of the ancient Lawgivers, simply affected Inspiration, he had then had no Occasion to propagate the Belief of a constant equal Providence, a Dispensation, if only pretended, so easy to be disproved. But by deviating from their general Practice, and persuading the People that the *inspiring tutelary God* would become their *King*, he laid himself under the Necessity of teaching an *extraordinary Providence*, and of perpetually insisting on it, as the great Sanction of the Law. Which it must be owned he does with uncommon Boldness throughout his whole Institute: but no where more remarkably than when he appeals to his Enemies themselves, for the essential Difference between his and their Dispensations of Religion. *Their Rock is*

“ *and with a stretched out Arm, and with Fury poured out will I*
 “ *rule over you. And I will bring you out from the People, and*
 “ *will gather you out of the Countries wherein ye are scattered,*
 “ *with a mighty Hand, and with a stretched out Arm, and*
 “ *with Fury poured out. And I will bring you into the Wil-*
 “ *derness of the People, and there will I plead with you Face*
 “ *to Face. Like as I pleaded with your Fathers in the Wilder-*
 “ *ness of the Land of Egypt, so will I plead with you, saith the*
 “ *Lord. And I will cause you to pass under the Rod. And I*
 “ *will bring you into the BOND OF THE COVENANT.*”

Chap. xx. v 31, ——— 37. It is here, we see, denounced that the extraordinary Providence should be withdrawn; or, in Scripture Phrase, *that God would not be enquired of by them*; that they should remain in the Condition of their *Fathers in the Wilderness*, when the extraordinary Providence, for their signal Disobedience was, for some Time, suspended. But for all that, tho' they strove to disperse themselves amongst the People round about, and projected in their Minds to be as the Heathen, and the Families of the Countries to serve Wood and Stone, yet they should still be held under the Government of a *Theocracy*; which, when administered without its naturally attendant Blessing of an extraordinary Providence was, and was justly called, the *ROD AND BOND OF THE COVENANT*.

not as our Rock, even our Enemies themselves being Judges^P. Had then Moses been only a human Lawgiver, and yet so wise and consummate in his Art, as, on that Principle, he must needs have been, he would never have ventured, unnecessarily, on so useless and dangerous a Project. But he did more; and, under Pretence of this *extraordinary Providence*, actually debarred his People of several of the Advantages attendant on the *ordinary Providence* of Heaven. We conclude therefore (and give the Deist fair Warning of it) that Moses's Pretensions were TRUE: And that his Establishment of a *Theocracy* is one of those ESSENTIAL MARKS that distinguish his Religion from all the Institutions of *Paganism*. But this by the Way only.

Our Business at present is not to shew that this *extraordinary Providence* was really administered, but that it is really said to be administered.

This, holy Scripture attests in one uniform unvaried manner, as well by recording many Instances of it in particular, as by constantly referring to it in general.

I. The first is in the *History of MIRACLES*. For an *equal Providence* being administered partly by *ordinary* and partly by *extraordinary* Means, these latter produce what we call *Miracles*, the Subject of the sacred Historian's more peculiar Regard. But I apprehend it would be thought presuming strangely on the Reader's Patience to expect his Attention while I set myself to prove that many Miracles are recorded in the History of the Jewish People. The simpler Sort of Deists fairly confess it; as appears by the free Names they give to such Relations. These therefore, for the present, we hear, and dismiss. But there are Refiners in Infidelity, such as *Spinoza* and his Man *Toland*; who

own many of the Facts, but deny them to have been miraculous. These are to our Purpose, and an Appeal to the common Sense of Mankind is a sufficient Answer to them all. And surely I should have done no more, had they not attempted to draw in to their Party much honeſter Men than themſelves. For ſuch, therefore, even Charity requires we ſhould attempt ſome kind of Defence.

The infamous *Spinoza* would perſuade us that JOSEPHUS himſelf was as backward in the Belief of Miracles as any modern Pagan whatſoever. The Handle, for his Calumny, is ^q that Writer's Relation of the *Paſſage* of the *Red-ſea*; which concludes with ſaying that *every Man may believe of it as he pleaſes*. No unuſual Way with this Hiſtorian of introducing or ending a miraculous Adventure. This has indeed ſo Libertine an Air, that it hath betrayed ſome Believers into the ſame falſe Judgment concerning him: As if *Joſephus* afforded to theſe

^q — Scriptura de natura in genere quibuſdam in locis affirmat eam fixum atque immutabilem ordinem fervare. — Philoſophus præterea in ſuo *Eccl.* clariffime docet nihil novi in natura contingere. — Hæc igitur in Scriptura expreſſe docentur, at nullibi, quod in natura aliquid contingat, quod ipſius legibus repugnet, aut quod ex iis nequeat ſequi, adeoque neque etiam Scripturæ afſingendum. — Ex quibus evidentiffime ſequitur miracula res naturales fuiſſe. — Attamen — de his unicuique, prout ſibi melius eſſe ſentiet, ad Dei cultum & religionem integro animo ſuſcipiendum, liberum eſt exiſtimare. Quod etiam JOSEPHUS SENTIT; ſic enim in conſuſione l. 2. *Antiq.* ſcribit, *Nullus vero diſcredat verbo miraculi, ſi antiquis hominibus, & malitia privatis via ſalutis liquet per mare facta, ſive voluntate Dei, ſive ſponte revelata: dum & eis, qui cum Alexandro rege Macedoniæ fuerunt olim, & antiquitus a reſiſtentibus Pamphylicum mare diviſum ſit, & cum aliud iter non eſſet, tranſitum præbuit iis, volente Deo, per eum Perſarum deſtruere principatum; & hoc conſitentur omnes, qui actus Alexandri ſcripſerunt, DE HIS ITAQUE, SICUT PLACUERIT CUILIBET, EXISTIMET. Hæc ſunt verba Joſephi, ejusque DE FIDE MIRACULORUM JUDICIUM. Tract. Theologico-Pol. C. vi. de Miraculis, p. 81, 82.*

Things

Things only a political or philosophical Belief, and gave a Latitude to those of his own Religion, to think as they should see Cause.

But here lies the Difficulty; the Historian is every now and then putting on a very different Aspect, and talking like a most determined Jew. Many are the Places where he expresses the fullest and firmest Belief of the *Divinity* of the *Mosaic* Religion, and of the *Truth* of the sacred Volumes. To mention only one or two, from a Book so known, and in a Point so notorious. The following Words of his Introduction shew in how different a Light he regarded *Moses* from all other Lawgivers: “ And now I earnestly
“ intreat all who take these Volumes in hand, to
“ apply themselves with their whole Faculties to the
“ Contemplation of the Divine Nature, and then
“ turn to our Lawgiver, and see whether he has not
“ made a Representation of that Nature entirely
“ worthy of it; Always assigning such Actions to
“ God as become his Excellence, and preserving
“ the high Subject clear from any impure Mixture
“ of FABLE. Though, if we consider the Distance
“ and Antiquity of the Time he wrote in, we can’t
“ but understand he was at full Liberty to invent and
“ falsify at Pleasure. For he lived full two thousand Years ago — A Distance of Time to which
“ even the Poets dare not carry up the Birth of
“ their Gods, the Actions of their Ancestors, or
“ the Establishment of their Laws.”

Ἡδη τοίνυν τὰς ἐν ἱστορίαις τοῖς βιβλίοις ᾠδακαλῶς τὴν γνώμην
Θεῶν προσανέχειν, καὶ δοκιμάζειν τὴν ἡμέτερον Νομοθέτην, εἰ τὴν τε
φύσιν αὐτῶν ἀξίως κατενόησε, καὶ τῇ δυνάμει πρεπέσας αἰεὶ τὰς πρά-
ξεις ἀνέβηκε, πάσης καθαρῶν τὴν περὶ αὐτῶν φυλάξας λόγον τὴν παρ’
ἄλλοις αἰχλήμοντι μυθολογίας· καί τοις, ὅσον ἐπὶ μήκει χρόνου καὶ πα-
λαιότητι, πολλὰ ἔχων ἁδεῖαν ψευδῶν πλασμάτων. γέγονεν γὰρ πρὸ
ἐτῶν διχιλίων, — ἐφ’ ὅσον πλήθος αἰῶνος εἰδ’ αὐτῶν οἱ ποιηταὶ τὰς
χρῆσεις τῶν Θεῶν, μή τι γε τὰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων πράξεις, ἢ τὰς νόμους
ἀνεσκεῖν ἐτόλμησαν. Vol. i. p. 3, 4.

And

And how *truly* divine he supposed the *Law*, appears from his observing, in the same Place, that, while the *Jews* religiously kept its Precepts, all things went well and prosperously; but that, whenever they transgressed, then nothing followed but Calamity and Distress. And lest any one should pretend he meant no more than that national Happiness was the natural Consequence of adhering to the Laws of their Country; or that those Laws, being founded on Just and Right, God (whose general Providence it is agreed he acknowledged) would reward the virtuous Observers, whatever were the Original of such Laws; lest, I say, this should be pretended, he adds, that these Disasters followed whenever they transgressed the Law, though in pursuit of Things just and good. His Words are these: “Upon the whole, what the Reader of
 “this History may chiefly learn from it is this:
 “That those, who obsequiously study the Will of
 “God, and reverence his well established Laws,
 “pass their Lives in incredible Prosperity; Hap-
 “piness, the Reward from God, ever attending
 “their Obedience. But in Proportion to their
 “Neglect of these Laws, easy Things become un-
 “surmountable, and all their Undertakings, *how*
 “*just soever*, end in incurable Calamities^s.” In which Words, I take it for granted, he had the Case of *Saul* particularly in his View. Again, so full was his Persuasion of the Divinity of the Law, that he extols the *Jews* for suffering *Ptolemy*, the

^s Τὸ Συῶλον ἔμαλιστα τις ἀνὲν ἐν ταύτης μάθοι τὴν ἰστορίαν, ἐβελή-
 σας αὐτὸν διελθεῖν, ὅτι μὴ τοῖς Θεῷ γνώμῃ καὶ ἀκολυθῇσι, καὶ τὰ κα-
 λῶς νομοθετηθέντα μὴ τολμῶσι ἀδραδαίνειν, πάντα καλορθῶν πέρα
 πίστεως, καὶ γέρας δὴ δαιμονίας πρῆκειλαι ἀπὸ Θεῷ· καθ’ ὅσον δ’ ἀν-
 δρῶσι τὰ τῶν ἀκριβοῦς ἐπιμελείας, ἀπορῶ μὴ γίνεσθαι τὰ πόρρωμα,
 τρέπεσθαι δ’ εἰς Συμφορὰς ἀνγκέας, ὅτι ποτ’ ἀν, ὡς ἀγαθὸν δεῖν
 παρδάσωσι. Vol. i. p. 3, 4.

Son of *Lagus*, to take their City by Storm on the seventh Day, rather than violate the *Sabbatic Rest*. *Agatharchides* (says he) *thinks this Scruple worthy of Contempt and Laughter*. But those who weigh it with Minds free from the Prejudice of Hatred, will see something truly great, and deserving of the highest Commendations, in thus always preferring their Piety towards God before their own Safety, or even the Freedom of their Country^t.

These Passages, we see, have all the Marks of a very zealous Believer. And what makes the greatest Difficulty of all, is, that the very Places in which the Historian uses such offensive Latitude of Expression are those where he employs his utmost Endeavours to shew the real Divinity of his Religion; of which these *Miracles* are produced as Evidence; an Evidence he studiously seeks, and seems to dwell upon with Pleasure.

This varying Aspect, therefore, so indifferently assumed, creates all the Embarrass. But would Men only do in this Case what they ought to do in all, when they pass their Judgment on an ancient Writing, that is, consider the *End*, and *Time*, and *Genius* of the Writer, together with the Character of those to whom the Work is addressed; they would find *Josephus* to be indeed a zealous Follower of the Law, and a sincere Believer of its *miraculous* Establishment; and, at the same time, see the easy Solution of all those untoward Appearances that have brought his Religion into question.

The Case, with our Historian, stood thus: His Country was now in great Distress; its Constitution overturned, and his Brethren in apparent Danger of

^t Τὸτο μὲν Ἀγαθαρχίδῃ κατεγγέλωτο ἄξιον δοκεῖ· τοῖς δὲ μὴ μὲν δυσωρείας ἐξελάσσει φαίνεσθαι μέγα καὶ πολλῶν ἄξιον ἐκωμίων, εἰ καὶ σωτηρίας καὶ παλαιοῖσι ἀνθρώποις τινες νόμων φυλακῇ καὶ τὸ πρὸς Θεὸν εὐσεβεῖαν αἰεὶ περιμῶσιν. Vol. ii. p. 458.

utter Extirpation. Calamities arising as much from the Prejudices the *Heathens* had entertained of the *Unsociableness* of their Religion^v, as from their own turbulent and rebellious Carriage^w. This *Pagan*

^v It was one of the principal Accusations which *Apion*, at that time, brought against the *Jews*, that they would not have Gods in common with other Nations; as we learn from *Josephus's* Tract against him, τί δ' ἡμῶν ἔτι καλὴγορεῖ τὸ μὴ κοινὰς ἔχειν τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς, Vol. ii. p. 477, 478. And *Celsus* calls that famous Maxim, *A Man cannot serve two Masters* (on which he supposed *Christians* founded the same Principle) THE VOICE OF SEDITION when Men are for breaking off all Society and Commerce with the rest of Mankind. Εἰδ' ἐξῆς ἐκείνοις ἡμᾶς εἰσάγει λέγοντας πρὸς τ' ἐπαπόρεσιν αὐτῶν, θελοντῶν ἡμᾶς καὶ τὰς Δαίμονας διαπραΰνειν, ὅτι οὐκ οἶόν τε διαλύειν τ' αὐτὸν πλείοσι κυρίοις. Τὸτο δ', ὡς οἶεται ΣΤΑΣΕΩΣ ἔτι ΦΩΝΗΝ, τῷ (ὡς αὐτὸς ὠνόμασε) ἀπειριχίζόντων ἑαυτῶν καὶ ἀπερῆγγνωτων ἀπὸ τῷ λοιπῶν ἀνθρώπων. *Orig. cont. Cels.* p. 380.

^w The late Translator of *Tacitus*, in his *Apologetical Discourses* for his Author, thinks fit, when he comes to speak of the Historian's Religious Character, to examine how he stood affected to the three great prevailing Religions of his Time. *Tacitus* had been generally blamed for his Malignity to the *Jews*. But to this his Translator says, "Concerning the *Jews* he followed the Traditions and Accounts current amongst the *Romans*: he tells you what different Relations there were, and neither adds any thing, nor misrepresents any thing maliciously. It was an obscure State, generally enslaved to some greater Power; to the *Affyrians*, *Egyptians*, *Grecians*, and then to the *Romans*; and contemned by all, as much as they themselves hated all; they had not common Mercy or Charity towards the Gentiles and Uncircumcised; and being persuaded that the Almighty loved only themselves, they fancied that he abhorred the whole human Race besides. So that it was said by *Tacitus*, too truly, adversus omnes alios hostile odium." *Discourse on Tac. Sect. 10.* p. 24. *Fol. Ed.* The Critics charge *Tacitus* with a calumnious Representation of the *Jewish* People. And how does his Apologist acquit him? With great Address. By repeating the very Calumny, and taking it all upon himself, in contending for the Truth of the Representation. The Generosity of Translators to their Principals hath been long taken notice of. But this is of a Strain a little uncommon; to become bound, Body for Body as it were, for a slippery Politician. And as if all this had not

Hatred had been greatly increased by its superior Aversion to *Christianity*, considered by them as a Sect of *Judaism*: which had carried its *Dissociability* as far, and its Pretensions much farther: so as to

been enough, he will load himself with a more wretched Calumny of *his own*, the *Jews* were persuaded, that the Almighty abhorred the whole human Race besides themselves. Where did he get this curious Anecdote? Not from the Bible, I can assure the Reader. It was a Comment on his sacred Author's Text, *adversus omnes alios hostile odium*. But, as is usual in these Cases, *Tacitus* was thinking of one thing, and his Translator (who lives in a different World) of another. By this *hostile odium* the Roman meant that *unsociable* Character of Religion which refused all *Intercommunity* with the Religions of Paganism. And this, the Translator, had he been more of a Critic, and less of a Politician, might have seen, by his Author's giving the very same Account of the *Christians*. [*Christiani*] *haud perinde in crimine incendii quam ODIUM HUMANI GENERIS convicti sunt*. *Annal.* 15. Sect. 44. [See *Div. Leg.* Vol. i. p. 293. Ed. 2.] And of these, our Discourser graciously owns, that it was not likely that they were yet so degenerated as to disgrace the *Christian Religion*. *Ib.* And yet all who differ from him or his Author, are *small-Wits and Pedants; small-Spirits and Bigots*.

But our Discourser having told us, that his Master had carried the Excellencies of Human Understanding as far as the utmost Efforts of Human Genius could carry them, another Objection would arise against his moral Character, How came he not to embrace the Faith of *Jesus*? To this you may be sure he does not want an Answer: Nor after the best Instruction could he have become a Believer, without the Illumination of the Spirit; which it is plain was withheld from him: and without a Change of Heart, it was impossible for him to conceive the Resurrection of the Dead, and the Crucifixion of the Son of God. *Ib.* What pitiful Buffoonry when his Master's Honour lies at stake! The Thing alluded to, which he thus envenoms, was no more than this: The primitive Writers have said, and we find, by every Day's Experience, they said true, that libertine profligate Scorners, grown old in Vice and Impiety, could never be brought to embrace the Precepts of the Gospel, without a Miracle.

But it seems *Tacitus*, like the *Free-Thinkers* and *small Politicians* of this Age, had as little Regard to the Religion he conformed to, as to those he publicly abused. Some Excuse, therefore, is to be made for this: "For his disregarding the Reli-

gion then received (says his Apologist) when I consider what
insist

insist on the Necessity of all Mens submitting to it, and renouncing their own Country Religions as the Impostures of Politicians, or the Inventions of evil Demons. This put the Heathen World into a Flame, and produced those mad and wicked Persecutions that attended the first Propagation of the *Christian Faith* ^x. Such was the unfriendly State of Things, when *Josephus* undertook an Apology for his Nation, in the *History of its Antiquities*. Now as the grand Accusation of their Conquerors was that their Religion required the Belief and Obedience of all Mankind (for they had, as we observed, confounded *Judaism* with *Christianity*) to wipe off this invidious Imputation we must conclude would be ever in the Author's Thoughts. So that when the Course of his History leads him to speak of the Effects of God's extraordinary Providence in the Conduct of this People, he sometimes adds to his Relation of a miraculous Adventure, *but in this every Man may believe as he pleases*. A Declaration merely to this

“ Sorts of Absurdities the PAGANS held for Religion, I cannot
 “ so much blame him. — It consisted in *no Purification of Heart,*
 “ *nor Amendment of Morals,* the thing which Men and Socie-
 “ ties require; but in Sounds, Gesticulation, and the Blood of
 “ Beasts: not in Truth and Sense, in Benevolence and Rectitude
 “ of Mind; but in lying Oracles, UNACCOUNTABLE MYSTE-
 “ RIES, and a raving Imagination.” — *Ib.* *Unaccountable My-*
steries! I believe so, both to this Writer and all his Tribe; for
 had he known any thing of their Nature or Original, he would
 never have ventured to say, while he professed any Regard to
 Truth, that *the Pagan Religion consisted in no Purification of Heart*
or Amendment of Morals, the Thing which Men and Societies re-
quire. See *Div. Leg. Book II. Sect. 4.*

And now what has this confident *Discourser* shewn? Even this, his Ignorance in all the three Religions alike, *Judaism, Christianity, and Paganism.* The only Secret he has taught us, which we did not know before, is that of Lord *Plausible's* in the *Play*, that he has an *ill Breath*, which taints and infects every thing within its Reach, that bears the Name of a RELIGION.

^x See the first Volume, p. 291. Ed. 2.

Effect: "The Jewish Religion was given by
 " God for the use of his chosen People, therefore
 " the Gentiles might believe as they pleased. The
 " Jews did not pretend they should leave their own
 " Country Religion to embrace theirs^y: That in
 " this they were different from the Christian Sect,
 " which required all Mankind to follow the Faith
 " of a crucified Saviour under Pain of endless De-
 " struction. But that yet they were not so *unhospi-*
 " *table*, but that they received with open Arms all
 " who were willing to worship one God the Creator
 " of the Universe^z." Thus we see how it came
 to pass, (which was the greatest of the Difficulty)
 that the Places where he gives such a Latitude of
 Belief, are those where he most labours to prove the
 Divinity of his Religion.

But this Solution clears up all Difficulties, and
 shews the Historian's great Consistency, as well as
 artful Address, throughout the whole Work. Jo-

^y In his Tract against *Apion* he has these remarkable Words:
It is becoming Men of Prudence and Moderation diligently to observe
their own Country Laws concerning Religious Matters, and to a-
void calumniating the Customs of others. But this Man [Apion]
abandoned his own Religion, and has since employed himself in in-
venting Lies of ours. Δεῖ γὰρ τὰς σύφρονας τοῖς μὴ οἰκείοις νόμοις
 πρὸς τὴν δόξαν ἀκρίτως ἐμμελεῖν, τὰς δὲ τῶν ἄλλων μὴ λοιδορεῖν· ὃ δὲ
 τὰς μὴ ἔφυγε, τὸ ἡμετέραν δὲ κατεψεύσατο. Vol. ii. p. 480.
 This was carrying his Complaisance to the Gentiles extremely
 far. But the Necessity was pressing; and he misses no Opportu-
 nity of conciliating their Good-will. Thus in his *Antiquities*,
 a Work, as we observed, entirely apologetical, he tells the Rea-
 der, l. iii. c. 6. that the seven Branches of the Golden Candlestick
 signified the *seven Planets*. But in his *Wars of the Jews*, l. vii.
 c. 5. § 5. he assures us they signified the Reverence in which
 the *Jews* held the *Number Seven*. But, Allegory for Allegory,
 he thought, I suppose, one as good as the other, and therefore
 might be allowed to use what best served his Occasions.

^z ——— καὶ τὰτο μόνον ἢ κοινόν, εἰ βάλον, πρὸς αὐτὰς καὶ πᾶ-
 σιν ἀνθρώποις, ἀρκεσμεν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν σέβειν τὸ Θεόν. Vol. i.
 p. 556.

sephus professes the most awful Regard to the sacred Volumes; and yet, at the same Time, takes such Liberties of going from their Authority, that it provoked the honest Resentment of a late excellent Writer to the following Asperities: “Nec levis sit
 “suspicio illum Hebraice non scivisse, cum multis
 “indiciis linguæ ejus imperitiam prodatur. Quivis
 “certe, cui vel mica falis est, sentiat illum Historias
 “Sacras pro arbitrio interpolasse, demendo, addendo,
 “immutando, ut Antiquitates suas ad Lectorum
 “Græcorum & Romanorum palatum accommo-
 “daret.” But this Licence, though surely to be condemned, was however something more legitimate and sober than is generally supposed. His Deviations from Scripture being in those Places *only*, where an exact Adherence to it would have increased that general Aversion to his Nation, whose Effects were at that Time so much to be dreaded, either as exposing the *perverse Nature* of the People, or the *unsociable Genius* of their Religion. To give an Instance or two of each:

1. The *Murmuring* of the *Israelites*, for *Bread* and *Flesh* in the Wilderness, is represented in Scripture, and justly^a, as an Act of horrid Ingratitude towards God. Yet *Josephus* makes *Moses* own they had Reason for their Complaints^b. And in the execrable Behaviour of the Men of *Gibeab* to the *Levite* and his Wife, though Scripture expressly says they attempted a more unnatural Crime than Adultery, yet the Historian passes this over in Silence, and makes all the personal Outrage attempted, as well as committed, to be offered to the Woman^c. The Reader will now easily account for what Mr. *Whiston* makes such a Wonder of, his Author’s

^a EXOD. xvi. ^b παθεῖν δ’ οὐκ ἀλόγως αὐτὰς διὰ τὸ ἀ-
 γὰρ κλῶ τὸ νομίσας. *Antiq. Jud.* l. iii. c. 1. § 5.
^c *Antiq. Jud.* l. v. c. 2. § 8.

Omission of the Story of the *golden Calf*^d. For this was so amazing a Perversity, at that Juncture, as must have made the very *Pagans* themselves ashamed of the *Jewish* Idolatries.

2. Again, we are told in Scripture, that when the *Cutheans*, or *Samaritans*, heard how that the *Jews*, who were returned from the Captivity, were rebuilding the Temple, they came and desired to be Partners in the Work, and joint Worshipers of the God for whom it was erected; to which the *Jews* gave this round Reply: *You have nothing to do with us, to build an House unto our God, but we ourselves together will build unto the Lord God of Israel, as King Cyrus the King of Persia hath commanded us*^e. And *Nehemiah*, on the same Occasion, gave them a still rougher Answer: *The God of Heaven he will prosper us, therefore we his Servants will arise and build: but you have no Portion,*

^d “ There is, amongst many other things that *Josephus*’s
 “ Copy appears to want, one Omission of so important a Nature
 “ — the heinous Sin of the Golden Calf. — What makes it
 “ stranger is this, that *Josephus*’s Account is not only negative,
 “ by a bare Omission, but positive, by affording an exact Cohe-
 “ rence without it, *nay such a Coherence as is plainly inconsistent*
 “ *with it.* And what still makes it more surprising is, that *Jo-*
 “ *sephus* frequently professes, neither to add to nor to take away
 “ from the Sacred Books.” *Dissert.* II. p. xlv. Some other Li-
 berties, which *Josephus* took with Scripture for the End above
 explained, made this learned Writer conclude that the Historian
 had an *earlier and more uncorrupt Copy of the Old Testament than*
any we now have: for that his Accounts are more exact, consistent,
and agreeable with Chronology, with natural Religion, and with
one another. p. xxxv. Yet, after all, the fatal Omission of the
 Golden Calf brings him to confess, *that Josephus*’s Copy appears
 to WANT many Things which are in ours. p. xlv. Thus sorely
 distressed is this good Man in the Support of a wild extravagant
 Hypothesis; while every one else sees that all the Omissions
 and Alterations (which sometimes make his Copy good, some-
 times bad) were designed Deviations from the sacred Volumes
 to conciliate the Good-will of his Masters,

^e EZRA iv. 3.

nor Right, nor Memorial in Jerusalem^f. This was a tender Place: it was touching upon the very Sore, in an exprefs Declaration of the Unsociableness complained of. The Story therefore, we may be sure, was to be softened before the Gentiles were to be intrusted with it. Accordingly, Josephus makes them speak in these obliging Terms: That they could not possibly admit them as Partners in the Work; for that the Command to build the Temple was directed to them, first by Cyrus and now by Darius: That indeed they were at Liberty to worship along with them: and that this was the only Community, in religious Matters, that they could enter into, with them, and with as many of the rest of Mankind, as were willing to come up to the Temple to adore the God of Heaven^g.

And now was not that a wise Project which proposed reforming the *sacred Text* by the Writings of *Josephus*?

But this Explanation will enable us to give the Grace-stroke to that *spurious* Passage concerning CHRIST. I think I have already offered one demonstrative Argument against it^h. And I suppose, the many Marks of Forgery are so glaring, that most Men would be willing to give it up, as *Josephus's* Silence on so extraordinary a Fact but easy to be accounted for. Now we have so far laid open his Conduct as to see that the preaching up of CHRIST was an Affair he would studiously decline. His great Point, as we observed, was to reconcile the Gentiles to his Countrymen. But the *Pagan* Aversion was greatly increased by the new Sect

^f NEH. ii. 20. ^g — ἔφασαν, “ ὅτι μὴ οἰκοδομίας αὐτῶν ἀδύνατον ἔστι κοινωνεῖν, αὐτοὶ δὲ πρῶτα χθένων καλῶς δουλεύσαι τὸ ναὸν, πρῶτον μὲν ὑπὸ Κύρου, νῦν δὲ ὑπὸ Δαρείου προσκυπεῖν ὃ αὐτοῖς ἐφίενται· καὶ τῷτο μόνον ἔστι κοινόν, εἰ βέλονται, πρὸς αὐτὸς καὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, ἀφικνεσθῆναι εἰς τὴν ἱερὴν σέβειν τὸ Θεόν. Vol. i. p. 556.

^h See Vol. i. p. 295. Ed. 2.

of *Christians*, sprung, as was well known, from the Country of *Judea*. It was therefore utterly destructive of his Purpose to shew, as he must have done, in giving them an Account of CHRIST, the close Connexion between the two Religions. Of all dangerous Subjects, therefore, *Josephus* would be careful to avoid this. So that (certain as I am of the Writer's Purpose, and not ignorant of the Liberty he took even with the sacred Records, when it served his Ends, of adding and omitting at pleasure) I should have been as much surprised to have found the *History of Jesus* in his Works as others are to be told that it is not there.

Thus did this excellent Writer out of extreme Love to his Country (the most pardonable however of all human Motives) make too free with Truth and Scripture; though most zealously attached to the Religion of his Forefathers: as those Men generally are who love their Country best. And a *Jew* he strictly was, of a very different Stamp too from that poor paltry Mimic of the *Greek Sophists*, *Philo*ⁱ. Of whom his Master *Plato* would have said, what *Josephus* tells us *Aristotle* did say of one of his *Jewish* Acquaintance, A GREEK HE WAS, AND NOT IN SPEECH ONLY, BUT IN SOUL LIKEWISE^k.

I judged it of Importance to set this Matter in a true Light: Because many, I supposed, would think it a fair Prejudice against the Divinity of the *Mosaic* Religion, had a Person, so eminent amongst his Countrymen while the Republic was yet existing, and of so learned an Age; so conversant in the

ⁱ *Philo*, in his *Life of Moses*, brings in the *Egyptian* Priests reasoning on the *Platonic* Principles, concerning the Soul that informed *Moses's* Body; which is altogether as well judged, as if a modern Writer of the *Life of Ptolemy* the Astronomer should bring him in explaining *Sir Is. Newton's Principia*.

^k Ἑλληνικὸς ὡς, ἔ τῇ Διὰλέκτῳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ ΨΥΧῃ.

Jewish Records, and so skilled in the best *Grecian* Literature; had such a one only afforded a political or philosophic Faith to the sacred Volumes. But then it will follow on the other hand, that the sincere *Belief* of one, so circumstanced, will be as fair a Prejudice in its Favour.

Not that I am over fond of this kind of Evidence, in Matters where every one is obliged to judge for himself; and consequently, where every one, on a due Application to the Subject, is capable of judging. Much less would I lay great Weight on the Opinions of Men out of their own Profession, however eminent in any other. What is it to Truth, for Instance, what a *Courtier* judges of a *Church*, a *Politician* of *Conscience*, or a *Geometer*, grown grey in *Demonstration*, of *moral Evidence*¹? To return:

Miracles, therefore, as they are recorded to be continued through so large a Period of this Republic, I give for one Proof of the *Scripture's* representing the *Jewish* People as under an *extraordinary Providence*. I say, as they are recorded to be *continued*: For when given but at the *first* Propagation of a Religion, as of the *Christian*, they are only to be esteemed the *Credentials* of a new Revelation. Thus the Apostles of *Jesus*, who worked *Miracles* as well as *Moses* and the Prophets, represent their Followers as under the same common Providence with the rest of Mankind. Unlike, in this, to the Propagators of the *Law*, who always declare the *Jews* to be under a *peculiar Providence*: Whose Declarations we come next to consider as another Proof of this Scripture Representation.

¹ Which requires an exact Discernment of all the various and almost infinite Degrees of *Probability*; while his Studies only teach him to know thus much of them in the gross, that they are not *Demonstrations*.

II. It is represented then as administered 1. Over the State in general. 2. Over private Men in particular. And such a Representation we should expect to find from the Nature of the Republic; because, as an extraordinary Providence over *the State* necessarily follows God's being their *tutelary Deity*; so an extraordinary Providence to *Particulars* follows as necessarily from his being their *supreme Magistrate*.

As to this Providence over the *State*, it would be absurd to quote Texts, when the whole Bible is but one continued History of it. Only it may not be amiss to observe, that from a Passage in *Ezekiel*, where God says, *Because that Moab and Seir do say, BEHOLD THE HOUSE OF JUDAH IS LIKE UNTO ALL THE HEATHEN^m*, it appears the *Jews* had boasted, and the Gentiles, till then, had acknowledged, that they were under an *extraordinary Providence*. As this therefore is so plain, I shall not hazard the obscuring it by many Words; but go on to shew, that *Scripture* represents this Providence as administered likewise to Particulars.

In the *Dedication* of the first Temple, *Solomon* addresses his Prayer to God, that the Covenant between him and the People might remain for ever firm and inviolate, and the old Oeconomy be still continued. And after having enumerated divers Parts of it, he proceeds in these Words: “ When
 “ the Heaven is shut up, and there is no Rain,
 “ *because they have sinned* against thee; yet if they
 “ pray towards this Place, and confess thy Name,
 “ and turn from their Sin when thou dost afflict
 “ them: Then hear thou from Heaven, and forgive
 “ the Sin of thy *Servants*, and of thy People *Israel*,
 “ when thou hast taught them the good way,
 “ wherein they should walk; and send Rain upon

^m Chap. xxv. v 8.

“ the Land, which thou hast given unto thy
 “ People for an Inheritance. If there be Dearth
 “ in the Land, if there be Pestilence, if there be
 “ Blasting or Mildew, Locust or Caterpillers; if
 “ their Enemies besiege them in the Cities of their
 “ Land; whatsoever Sore, or whatsoever Sickneſs
 “ there be: Then what Prayer or what Supplication
 “ ſhall be made of any Man, or of all thy People
 “ *Israel*, when every one ſhall know his own Sore,
 “ and his own Grief, and ſhall ſpread forth his
 “ Hands in this Houſe; then hear thou from
 “ Heaven and forgive, and render unto every Man
 “ according unto all his Ways, whoſe Heart thou
 “ knoweſtⁿ.” The Pſalmiſt bears his Teſtimony
 to the ſame Oeconomy: *I have been young* (ſays he)
and now am old: yet have I not ſeen the Righteous
forſaken, nor his Seed begging their Bread^o. GOD
 himſelf declares it, by the Prophet *Iſaiah*: *Say ye*
to the Righteous that it ſhall be well with him: for
they ſhall eat the Fruit of their Doings. Wo unto
the Wicked, it ſhall be ill with him: for the Reward
of his Hands ſhall be given him^p. And again: *He*
that walketh righteouſly and ſpeaketh uprightly, &c.
he ſhall dwell on high: his Place of Defence ſhall be
the Munitions of Rocks, Bread ſhall be given him,
his Waters ſhall be ſure^q. And we learn from a
 parabolical Command in *Ezekiel* how exactly theſe
 Promiſes were fulfilled: “ And the Lord ſaid unto
 “ him, Go through the Miſt of the City, through
 “ the Miſt of *Jeruſalem*, and ſet a Mark upon the
 “ Foreheads of the Men that ſigh, and that cry
 “ for all the Abominations that be done in the Miſt
 “ thereof. And to others he ſaid in mine Hearing,
 “ Go ye after him through the City, and ſmite: let
 “ not your Eye ſpare, neither have ye Pity. Slay

ⁿ 2 CHRON. vi. 28, & ſeq.

^o PSAL. xxxvii. 25.

^p Chap. iii. v 10, 11.

^q Chap. xxxiii. v 15, 16.

“ utterly

“utterly old and young, both Maids and little
 “Children, and Women; *but come not near any*
 “*Man upon whom is the Mark*; and begin at my
 “Sanctuary^r,” &c. But GOD, by the Prophet
Amos, describes this Administration of Providence
 in the fullest manner: “Also I have withholden
 “the Rain from you, when there were yet three
 “Months to the Harvest, *and I caused it to rain*
 “*upon one City, and caused it not to rain upon an-*
 “*other City*: one Piece was rained upon, and the
 “Piece whereupon it rained not, withered. So two
 “or three Cities wandered unto one City to drink
 “Water; but they were not satisfied: yet have ye
 “not returned unto me, saith the Lord. I have
 “smitten you with Blasting and Mildew, &c.^s”
 And again: *Lo I will command, and I will sift the*
House of Israel amongst all Nations, like as Corn is
sifted in a Sieve, yet shall not the least Grain fall
upon the Earth^t.

The inspired Writers of the *New Testament* give Evidence to *this* Dispensation of Providence under the *Old*. The Author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* argues from it as a thing well known and generally allowed: *For if the Word spoken by Angels was stedfast, and EVERY TRANSGRESSION AND DISOBEDIENCE RECEIVED A JUST RECOMPENCE OF REWARD, how shall we escape if we neglect so great Salvation^c?*

St. Paul, in his *Epistle to the Romans*, speaking of the Advantages which Christianity had over *Judaism*, says: *Therefore being justified by Faith, we have Peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. By whom also we have Access by Faith into his Grace, wherein we stand, and rejoice in Hope of the Glory of God. And not only so, but WE GLORY IN TRIBU-*

^r Chap. ix. v 4,—6.

^s Chap. iv. v 7,—11.

^t Chap. ix. v 9.

[†] Chap. ii. v 2, 3.

LATION ALSO, knowing that Tribulation worketh Patience^w, &c. Here St. Paul opposing the Advantages which the Gentile Converts had by Faith, to those which the Jews, in Contempt of the Gentiles, so much gloried in, adds, in order to shew these Advantages in their highest Superiority, that the Christian Gentiles could glory even in that which was the very Opprobrium of the Jews, namely Tribulation. For the Sanction of the Jewish Law being temporal Rewards and Punishments, administered by an equal Providence; Tribulation was a Punishment for Crimes, and, consequently, an high Opprobrium. But the Followers of Christ, who were taught, that we must through much TRIBULATION enter into the Kingdom of God^x, had the same Reason to glory in the Roughness of the Road, as the ancient Agonistæ had in the Toils which procured them the Victory. This is urged with great Address. But the Critics, not taking the Apostle's Meaning, have supposed in their usual way, that he here broke in on his Argument, with an Idea foreign to the Point in question.

This will help us to explain an odd Remark of the excellent Maimonides: *That their wise Men talked of a thing which was NOT TO BE FOUND in the LAW, namely, that which some of them call the CHASTISEMENTS OF LOVE, by which they meant that TRIBULATIONS might befall a Man without any precedent Sin^y, and only in order to multiply his Reward. And that this was the very Opinion of the Sect called Muatzal, of which, or in Favour of*

^w ROM. v. 1, & seq.

^x ACTS xiv. 22.

^y This Explanation was necessary; for another kind of Chastisements of Love there was in the Law, namely paternal Chastisements. Thus Moses: *Thou shalt also consider in thine Heart, that as a Man chasteneth his Son, so the Lord thy God chasteneth thee.* DEUT. viii. 5.

which Opinion, there is not one single Word to be found in the Law^z. This seems to have perplexed our Rabbi; and with Cause. He lived when his Countrymen were under a common Providence, and had the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, which, he took for granted, was always in the Jewish Oeconomy. These Things disabled him from seeing that NO CHASTISEMENTS OF LOVE was a necessary Consequence of *temporal* Rewards and Punishments administered by an *equal Providence*: As likewise that when that Sanction ceased, and a future State was known, that then CHASTISEMENTS OF LOVE was as necessary a Consequence.

But if by the *Law*, Maimonides, as the Jews frequently do, included the Writings of the Prophets, then he was very much mistaken in saying there is not one Word in it concerning the *Chastisements of Love*. For Zechariah, prophesying of a new Dispensation, describes these Sort of *Chastisements* in very express Terms: “And I will bring
“the third Part thro’ the Fire, and will refine them
“as Silver is refined, and will try them as Gold is
“tried: and they shall call on my Name, and I
“will hear them^a.” So admirably do all the Parts of God’s grand Oeconomy support one another.

We have seen what Testimonies their coeval Writers afford of an *extraordinary Providence*. But we must not suppose the Jews always held the same Language. The Difference is great between the

^z Unum tamen occurrit in verbis sapientum nostrorum, quod NON INVENITUR IN LEGE; id nempe quod quidam eorum dicunt CASTIGATIONES AMORIS. Juxta hanc enim sententiam possunt TRIBULATIONES alicui evenire sine præcedente peccato, sed ut multiplicetur ejus Remuneratio. Atque hæc ipsissima est sententia Sectæ Muatzali, de qua, aut pro qua ne verbum quidem in Lege reperitur. *More Nervoeh. Buxtorfi*, p. 381.

^a Chap. xiii. § 9.

early and later *Jews*, even during the Existence of the Republic. Take an Instance from the *Psalmist*, and the Writer of *Ecclesiasticus*. The former says, *I have been young and now am old, yet have I not seen the Righteous forsaken, nor his Seed begging their Bread^b*. The latter, — *Look at the GENERATIONS OF OLD, and see: Did ever any trust in the Lord and was confounded? Or did any abide in his Fear and was forsaken? Or whom did he ever despise that called upon him^c?* The *Psalmist* living under an extraordinary Providence appeals to his own Times; the *Author of Ecclesiasticus*, when it was long ceased, appeals to former Times.

It is my Business at present, only to shew an extraordinary Providence *represented*; the Proofs of its *real Existence* are to come after. Yet as we have been told that this *Representation* is only an Eastern Hyperbole, in which every Thing is ascribed to God, I think it not improper to take notice here of one singular Circumstance in Favour of the *Character* of the *Representers*.

We may observe then, that the Spirit of *Gentilism* was always uniform; and, throughout its whole Duration, had ever the same unvaried Pretensions to Divine Intercourse, supported by the same Sort of Oracles and Divinations. But amongst the *Jews* Matters were on another footing. After their perfect Settlement, on their Return from Captivity, (when we know from the Course and Progress of God's Oeconomy, that the extraordinary Providence was to cease) we hear no more of their Pretences to it, though they now adhered more strictly than ever to the Religion of their Forefathers. They pretended not, as we see by the excellent Writer of the First Book of *Maccabees*, either to *Prophets*, Ora-

^b PSAL. xxxvii. 25.^c Chap. ii. v 10.

cles, or *extraordinary Dispensations*. When they write unto the *Lacedemonians*, for the Renewal of their Alliance, they tell them, at the same Time, that they need it not, FOR THAT THEY HAVE THE HOLY BOOKS OF SCRIPTURE IN THEIR HANDS TO COMFORT THEM^d. Language very different from their Forefathers', when God was wont to send immediate Help from the Sanctuary. How ingenuously does the same Historian relate the Misfortune of *Bethsura*, caused by the Observance of the Sabbatic Year^e? A Misfortune of which we have no Instance before the Captivity; and therefore a plain Evidence that the extraordinary Providence was indeed withdrawn. Besides, if we consider the Nature of the *Religion*, the Genius of the *People*, and the Circumstances of the *Time*, we shall find they all concurred to favour the Continuance of a Pretension to an extraordinary Providence, had it been *only a Pretension*.

1. The *Mosaic Religion*, like the *Pagan*, had a *public Part*, and therefore the *Jews* might, with the greatest Ease, have still carried on the Superstition of *Oracles*, had their Oracles been indeed a Superstition; especially as they were now become so closely attached to their Religion. For when did ever *Greece* or *Italy* confess that their *Oracles* were become *dumb*, 'till their Consulters had generally forsaken them, and the whole Frame of their Religion was falling to pieces? Besides, the Practice of this Superstition had been as easy as it was commodious; for the Oracular Voice was wont to come from the *Mercy-Seat* behind the *Veil*.

2. The Genius of the People too would have contributed to continue these Pretensions. For some how or other, it was become their Character

^d Chap. xii. § 9.

^e 1 MACC. vi. 49.

to require a Sign; and tho' now really superstitious, yet the Humour spent itself rather in telling Lyes of former Times^f, than in inventing any of their own. This, on a Supposition of the human Invention of their Law, is altogether *unaccountable*. But take the Matter as we find it in their sacred Books, and nothing is more *easy*. For if they had indeed been long accustomed to a *miraculous* Dispensation, they would, ever after, be strongly disposed to require a Sign; but it would be only such a Sign as bore the evident Marks of a Divinity; which not being to be had in human Inventions, they would be kept safe from Delusions, and made sensible of the Difference of Times: And such was in fact their very Case.

3. Add to all this, that the Time of the *Maccabees* was the Season of Enthusiasm, when that airy Spirit is at its Height; after the national Genius, long sunk by Oppression, begins to rise and recover itself to a Vindication of public Liberty. And of this we have a signal Instance in the Person of *Judas Maccabæus* himself; who, in Imitation of *Gideon*, would set upon an Army of twenty thousand Foot and two thousand Horse, with only eight hundred straggling Desperado's; which rash and fanatic Attempt was followed with the Fortune that

^f The Writer of the *first Book of Maccabees* appears to have lived in the Times he wrote of; and we find no Wonders nor Prodigies in his History. But a long Time after comes the Author of the *second Book*, an Epitomizer of one *Jason of Syrene*; and he largely supplies what he thought the other wanted. This Man is such a Lover of Prodigies, that, when he has made a monstrous Lye, and has so frightened himself at the Size of it that he dare not tell it out, he insinuates it [as Chap. xii. § 22. — ἐν τῷ ἑσπέρῳ ἐφωσάντο ἐπιφανείας. Chap. xv. § 27. τῇ δὲ οὐκ ἐπιφανεία.] Nay he even ventures at an *Apology* for lying Wonders, [Chap. xv. § 11.] and under this Encouragement falls a lying to Purpose, [Chap. xii. § 16.]

might at this Time have been expected ^g. In such a Season too, artful Leaders are most disposed to support themselves on Revelations; have most need of them; and are thought, by the People, most worthy to receive them.

From all this I conclude, that as amidst the Concurrence of so many favourable Circumstances, no such Pretensions were made; but that, contrary to the universal Practice of all false Religions, the *Jews* saw and owned a great Change in the Divine Oeconomy, that therefore their former Pretensions to the peculiar Protection of Heaven were TRUE.

But it hath been objected that the sacred Writers themselves frequently speak of the *Inequality* of Providence to *Particulars* ^h; and in such a Manner as Men living under a common Providence are accustomed to speak. It is very true that the sacred Writers do now and then give Intimations of this Inequality. And therefore, though we shall hereafter prove an extraordinary *Providence* to have been actually administered, in which, not only this Objection will be seen to drop of itself, but the particular Passages on which it is founded will be distinctly considered; Yet, for the Reader's Satisfaction, it may not be amiss to shew here, that these Representations of *Inequality* are very consistent with that before given of the extraordinary Providence. We say therefore,

I. That when the Sacred Writers speak of the *Inequalities* of Providence, and the unfit Distribution

^g 1 MAC. ix. 6. ^h — Asaph de Dei providentia dubitavit, & fere a vera via deflexisset — Salomon etiam, cujus tempore res Judæorum in summo vigore erant, suspicatur omnia casu contingere — Denique omnibus fere prophetis hoc ipsum valde obscurum fuit, nempe quomodo ordo naturæ & hominum eventus cum conceptu quem de providentia Dei formaverant, possent convenire. — *Spinozæ Theologico-Pol.* p. 73, 74.

of Things, they sometimes mean that State of it amongst their *Pagan* Neighbours, and not in *Judea*: As particularly in the Book of *Psalms* and *Ecclesiastes*.

II. We sometimes find particular Men complaining of *Inequalities* in Events, which were indeed the Effects of a most *equal* Providence. Such as the Punishment of *Posterity* for the Crimes of their *Forefathers*; and of *Subjects* for their *Kings*. Of the first, the Prophet *Ezekiel* gives us an Instance in the People's Case: *What mean ye, that you use this Proverb concerning the Land of Israel, saying, The Fathers have eaten sour Grapes, and the Childrens Teeth are set on edge*ⁱ? Of the second, *David* in his own; who seemed not to attend to the Justice of this Proceeding, where he says, *But these Sheep, what have they done*^k? And that he was sometimes too hasty in judging of these Matters appears from his own Confession: *Behold these are the ungodly, who prosper in the World, they increase in Riches — When I thought to know this, it was too painful for me: until I went into the Sanctuary of God; then understood I their End. Surely thou didst set them in slippery Places: thou castedst them down into Destruction — So foolish was I, and ignorant: I was as a Beast before thee*^l. That is, I understood not the Course of thy Justice, till I had considered the *Way* in which an equal Providence must necessarily be administered under a *Theocracy*, and the *Consequences* of such an Administration. For

III. Even admitting the Reality of an *equal* Providence to Particulars in the *Hebrew* State, the Administration of it must needs be attended with such Circumstances as sometimes to occasion those Observations of *Inequality*. For 1. it appears, from

ⁱ Chap. xviii. v. 2.

^k 2 SAM. xxiv. 17.

^l Ps. lxxiii. 12 — 22.

the Reason of the Thing, that this Administration did not begin to be exerted in particular Cases till the civil Laws of the Republic had failed of their Efficacy. Thus where any Crime, as for Instance Disobedience to Parents, was *public*, it became the Object of the civil Tribunal, and is accordingly ordered to be punished by the Judge^m. But, when *private* and *secret*, then it became the Object of Divine Vengeanceⁿ. Now the Consequence of this was, that when the Laws were remissly or corruptly administered, *good* and *ill* would sometimes happen unequally to Men. For we are not to suppose that Providence, in this Case, generally, interfered till the corrupt Administration itself, when ripe for Vengeance, had been first punished. 2. In this extraordinary Administration, one Part of the Wicked was sometimes suffered as a Scourge to the other. 3. The extraordinary Providence to the State might sometimes clash with that to Particulars, as in the Plague for numbering the People. 4. Sometimes the extraordinary Providence was suspended for a Season to bring on a national Repentance: But at the same Time this Suspension was publicly denounced^o. And a very severe Punishment it was, as leaving a State which had not the Sanction of a future State of Rewards and Punishments in a very disconsolate Condition. And this was what occasioned the Complaints of the impatient *Jews*, after they had been so long accustomed to an extraordinary Administration^p.

IV. But the full and general Solution of the Difficulty is this, The common Cause of these Complaints arose from the GRADUAL WITHDRAWING

^m EXOD. xxi. 15, and 17. ⁿ DEUT. xxvii. 16. and PROV. xxx. 17. ^o ISAIAH iii. 5. Chap. lix. v 2. Chap. lxi. v 7. ^p IS. v. 19. JEREM. xvii. 15. AMOS v. 18. ZEPH. i. 12. MALAC. ii. 17.

the extraordinary Providence. Under the *Judges* it was perfectly equal. And during that Period of the *Theocracy*, it is remarkable we hear of no Complaints at all. When the People had rebelliously demanded a King, and their Folly was so far complied with, that God suffered the *Theocracy* to be administered by a *Viceroy*, there was then, as was fitting, a great Abatement in the Vigour of this extraordinary Providence; partly in natural Consequence, God being now farther removed from the immediate Administration; and partly in Punishment of their Rebellion. And soon after this it is that we first find them beginning to make their Remarks and Complaints of *Inequality*. From hence to the Time of the *Captivity*, the extraordinary Providence kept gradually decaying, till on their full Resettlement, it intirely ceased. For what great Reasons, besides Punishment for their Crimes; and what Consequences it had on the religious Sentiments of the People, will be occasionally explained as we go along.

I will only observe at present, what the least Reflection on this Matter so naturally suggests, that this *Complaint of Inequality* never could have come from good Men, as it did even from *Jeremiah* himself, who thus expostulates with the Almighty: *Righteous art thou, O Lord, when I plead with thee: yet let me talk with thee of thy Judgments: Wherefore doth the Way of the Wicked prosper? Wherefore are all they happy that deal very treacherously?* It never, I say, could have come from such Men, had they been at all acquainted with the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments; or had they not been long accustomed to an extraordinary Providence.

^a Chap. xii. v 1.

S E C T. V.

THUS we see that an *extraordinary Providence* was the necessary Consequence of a *Theocracy*; and that this Providence is represented in Scripture to have been really administered. *Temporal Rewards and Punishments*, therefore, the Effects of this Providence, and not *future*, MUST NEEDS BE THE SANCTION of their *Law and Religion*.

Having thus prepared the Ground, and laid the Foundation, I go on to shew that *future Rewards and Punishments*, which COULD NOT BE THE SANCTION of the *Mosaic Dispensation*, WERE NOT TAUGHT in it *at all*: and that, in Consequence of this Omission, the PEOPLE had not the Doctrine of a future State for many Ages. And here my Arguments will be chiefly directed against the *believing* Part of my Opponents; no *Deist*^r, that I know of, ever pretending that the Doctrine of a future State was there to be found.

MOSES delivered to the *Israelites* a complete Digest of Law and Religion: But, to fit it to the Nature of a *Theocratic Government*, he gave it perfectly *incorporated*. And, for the Observance of his *intire* Institution, he added the *Sanction* of Re-

^r The Atheist *Vanini*, indeed, seems to rank *Moses* in the Number of those Politicians, who, he says, promised a *future State* that the Cheat might never be found out. — In unica naturæ lege, quam *natura*, quæ Deus est (*est enim principium motus*) in omnium gentium animis inscripsit. Cæteras vero leges non nisi figmenta & illusiones esse asseriebant, non a cacodæmone aliquo inductas (*fabulosum namque illorum genus dicitur a philosophis*) sed a principibus ad subditorum pædagogiam excogitatas, & a sacrificulis ob honoris & auri aucupium confirmatas, non miraculis, sed scriptura, cujus nec originale ullibi adinvenitur, quæ miracula facta recitet, & bonarum ac malarum actionum repromissiones polliceatur, in futura tamen vita, ne fraus detegi possit. — De admirandis naturæ arcanis.

wards and Punishments: Both of which we have shewn to be necessary for the Support of a Republic: and yet that Civil Society, as such, can administer only one^s.

Now in the *Jewish Republic*, both the Rewards and Punishments promised by Heaven, were *temporal only*. Such as Health, long Life, Peace, Plenty, and Dominion, &c. Diseases, immature Death, War, Famine, Want, Subjection, and Captivity, &c. And in no one Place of the *Mosaic Institutes* is there the least Mention, or any intelligible Hint, of the Rewards and Punishments of another Life.

When SOLOMON restores the Integrity of Religion; and, to the regulated Purity of Worship, adds the utmost Magnificence; In his *Dedication* of the new-built Temple, he addresses a long Prayer to the God of *Israel*, consisting of one grand solemn Petition for the Continuance of the *old Covenant* made by the Ministry of *Moses*. He gives an exact Account of *all its Parts*, in which he explains at large the *divine Sanction* of the *Jewish Law and Religion*. And here we find nothing but, as in the Writings of *Moses*, *temporal Rewards and Punishments only*; without the least Hint or Intimation of a future State.

The Holy PROPHETS speak plainly of no other. Thus *Isaiab*: “Then shall he give the Rain of
“thy Seed that thou shalt sow the Ground withal,
“and Bread of the Increase of the Earth, and it
“shall be fat and plenteous: and in that Day shall
“thy Cattle feed in large Pastures. — And there
“shall be upon every high Mountain, and upon
“every high Hill Rivers and Streams of Water^t.”
And *Jeremiab*: “I will surely consume them, saith

^{s i e.} Punishments. See the first Vol. p. 14, & seq. 2^d Edit.
^t Chap. xxx. v 23, 25,

“ the Lord ; there shall be no Grapes on the Vine,
 “ nor Figs on the Fig-tree, and the Leaf shall
 “ fade, and the Things that I have given them
 “ shall pass away from them. — I will send Serpents
 “ and Cockatrices amongst you, which will not be
 “ charmed, and they shall bite you, saith the Lord^v. ”

Nay so little known, in these Times, was any other kind of Rewards and Punishments to the *Jewish People*, that, when the Prophets foretell that NEW Dispensation, by which Life and Immortality were brought to Light, they express even those *future Rewards and Punishments* under the Image of the *present*. Thus *Zechariah*, prophesying of the Times of CHRIST, describes the Punishment attendant on a Refusal of the *Terms of Grace*, under the Ideas of the *Jewish Oeconomy* : “ And it shall be
 “ that whoso will not *come up of all the Families of*
 “ *the Earth* unto *Jerusalem*, to worship the King
 “ the Lord of Hosts, even upon them SHALL BE
 “ NO RAIN^w. ” I would have those Men well consider this, who persist in thinking that the early *Jews* had the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, though *Moses* taught it not expressly to them ; and then tell me why *Zechariah*, when prophesying of the Gospel Times, should chuse to express these *future Rewards and Punishments* under the Image of the *present* ?

Indeed, were it not for the amazing Prejudices that have obtained on this Subject, a Writer's Pains in proving that a *future State* of Rewards and Punishments makes no Part of the *Mosaic Dispensation*, would appear as absurd to every intelligent Reader, as his who should use many formal Arguments to shew that Sir *Is. Newton's Theory of Light and Colours* is not to be found in *Aristotle's Books de Cælo, & de Coloribus*. I will therefore for once

^v Chap. viii. § 13, 17.

^w Chap. xiv. § 17.

presume so much on the Privilege of common Sense, as to suppose the Reader may be now willing to confess, that the Doctrine of Life and Immortality was not yet known to a People *sitting in Darkness, and in the Region and Shadow of Death*^x; and go on to other Matters that have more need to be explained.

II.

I shall shew then, in the next Place, that this *Omission* was not *accidental*; or of a Thing *Moses* did not well understand: But that, on the contrary, it was a *designed* Omission; and of a thing well known by him to be of high Importance to Society.

I. That the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments was studiously omitted, I prove from several Circumstances in the Book of *Genesis*. For the History of *Moses* may be divided into two Periods; from the Creation to his Mission, and from his Mission to the delivering up his Command to *Joshua*; the *first* written by him in quality of *Historian*, the *second* of *Legislator*; in both of which he preserves an equal Silence concerning the Doctrine of a *future State*.

1. In the *History of the Fall* it is to be observed, that he mentions only the *Instrument* of the *Agent*, the *Serpent*; not the *Agent* himself, the *Devil*: And the Reason is plain; there was a close Connection between that Agency, — The *spiritual* Effects of the Fall, — the Work of *Redemption*, — and the Doctrine of a *future State*. What but this could be the Cause of the Omission? when it is so evident that the Knowledge of this grand Enemy of our Welfare would have been the likeliest Cure of Idolatry, as teaching Men to esteem it a mere diabo-

^x MATTH. iv. 16,

lical Illusion. And in fact we find, that when the *Israelites* were taught, by the later Prophets, to consider it in this Light, we hear no more of their *Idolatries*. Hence we see, that the Folly of those who, with *Collins*, would have no more meant than a mere Serpent, is just equal to theirs who, with the *Cabbalists*, would have that Serpent a mere Allegory: And that the Comment of those orthodox Divines, who consider the Story in neither of these Lights, but as the Relation of a real Fact *obscurely* and *imperfectly* told, is not arbitrarily jumping from *Figure* to *Letter*, or from one Refuge to another; but is the natural Effect of following an uniform consistent way of Interpretation throughout.

2. In his History of *Enoch's Translation*^y to Heaven^z, there is so studied an Obscurity that several of the *Rabbins*, as *Aben Ezra* and *Jarchi*, fond as they are of finding a future State in the *Pentateuch*, interpret *this* as only signifying an immature Death. *And Enoch walked with God, and he was not, for God took him.* How unlike the Relation of the same Case in *Elijah*: “And it came to pass
“when the Lord would take up *Elijah* into Hea-
“ven by a Whirlwind, that *Elijah* went with *E-*
“*lisha* from *Gilgal*, &c. — And it came to pass as
“they still went on and talked, that behold there
“appeared a Chariot of Fire, and Horses of Fire,
“and parted them both asunder, and *Elijah* went
“up by a Whirlwind into Heaven^a.” The Reason of this Difference is evident; when the latter History was written, it was thought fit to lay a Preparation for the Dawning of a future State of Reward and Punishment, which in the Time of *Moses* had been highly improper. The Reflections of an eminent Critic on this Occasion, will shew how little he

^y GEN. v. 24.^z HEB. xi. 5.^a 2 KINGS ii.

1, 11.

penetrated into the true Design of this Oeconomy:
 “ *Mirum* est Mosem rem tantam, si modo immor-
 “ talem Henochum factum credidit, tam obiter,
 “ tamque obscure, quasi EAM LATERE VELLE,
 “ perstrinxisse. *Fortè* cum hæc ex antiquissimis
 “ monumentis exscriberet, nihil præter ea quæ no-
 “ bis tradidit invenit, quibus aliquid adjicere religio
 “ fuit^b. ” For *Moses* both *knew* and *believed* the
Immortality, and *purposely obscured* the Fact from
 whence it might have been collected. But what is
 most singular in this Reflection is, that the learned
 Commentator, to aggravate the Obscurity, says it
is as obscure, as if he purposely designed to hide it,
 supposing *that* to be the highest of Improbabilities,
which is, indeed, the true Solution of the Difficulty.
 So greatly does the Subject of our Enquiry want
 setting in a clear Light.

3. In his History of the *Patriarchs*, he entirely
 omits, or throws into the darkest Shades, the Ac-
 counts of those Revelations, which we learn, from
 the Writers of the New Testament, some of them
 were actually favoured with, concerning the Re-
 demption of Mankind. Of which we shall give,
 ere long, a great and noble Instance in the Case of
 ABRAHAM, who, as we are assured by JESUS him-
 self, *rejoiced to see CHRIST's Day, and saw it, and*
was glad.

From whence therefore could all this studied
 Caution arise but to keep out of sight that Doctrine,
 which for Ends truly worthy of the Divine Wif-
 dom, he had omitted in his Institutes of Law and
 Religion. This shews the Weakness of that Eva-
 sion, which would reconcile the *Omission* to the
 People's *Knowledge* of the Doctrine, by supposing
 they had been so well instructed by the Patriarchs,

^b Vid. *Clericum* in GEN. V. 24.

that *Moses* had no occasion to say any thing farther on that Subject.

Let me observe by the way, that these Considerations are more than a thousand Arguments to prove, that *Moses* was the real Author of the Book of *Genesis*.

II. That the Importance of the Doctrine of a future State of Reward and Punishment to Society was well understood by *Moses*, I prove from a particular Provision (besides that general one of an *extraordinary* Providence) made in his Dispensation, to oppose to the hurtful Consequences of the *Omission*.

We have shewn at large, in the first Volume, that under a *common* or *unequal* Providence, civil Government could not be supported without a Religion teaching a future State of Reward and Punishment. And it is the great Purpose of this Work to prove, that the *Mosaic* Religion *wanting* that Doctrine, the *Jews* must *really* have enjoyed that *equal* Providence under which Holy Scripture represents them to have lived. And then, no Transgressor escaping Punishment, nor any Observer of the Law missing his Reward, human Affairs might be kept in good Order without the Doctrine of a future State. Yet still the Violence of irregular Passions would make some sort of Men, of stronger Complexions, superior to all the Fear of *personal temporal Evil*. To lay hold therefore of these, and to gain a due Ascendant over the most determined, the Punishments, in this Institution, are extended to the *Posterity* of wicked Men; which the instinctive Fondness of Parents to their Offspring would make terrible even to those who had hardened themselves into an Insensibility of personal Punishment: *I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the Iniquity of the Fathers upon the Children*
unto

unto the third and fourth Generation of them that hate me^c.

Now that *this Punishment* was only to supply the want of a *future State* is evident from hence. Towards the Conclusion of this *extraordinary Oeconomy*, when God, by the later Prophets, reveals his Purpose of giving them a *NEW Dispensation*, in which a future State of Reward and Punishment was to be *brought to light*, it is then declared in the most express manner, that he will abrogate the Law of punishing Children for their Parents Crimes. *Jeremiah*, speaking of this *new Dispensation*, says: “In *those Days* they shall say no more, the Fathers
“ have eaten a sour Grape, and the Children’s
“ Teeth are set on edge: But every one shall die
“ for his own Iniquity, every Man that eateth the
“ sour Grape, his Teeth shall be set on edge.
“ Behold the Days come, saith the Lord, that I will
“ make a *NEW COVENANT* with the House of *Israel*,
“ — NOT according to the Covenant that I made
“ with their Fathers in the Day that I took them
“ by the hand to bring them out of the Land of
“ *Egypt*^d, &c. And *Ezekiel*, speaking of the same Times, says: “ I will give them one Heart, and
“ will put a *new Spirit* within you, &c. — But as
“ for them, whose Heart walketh after the Heart
“ of their abominable Things — *I will recompense*
“ *their way* UPON THEIR OWN HEADS, saith the
“ Lord God^e.” And again: “ What mean ye,

^c EXOD. xx. 5. Chap. xxxiv. § 7. But as God acted with them in the Capacity of the *Creator* and *Father of all Things*, as well as of *tutelary God* and *King*, he was pleased, at the same time, to provide that they should never lose the Memory of the Attributes of the *Almighty*: And therefore adds, — *And shewing Mercy unto Thousands in them that love me and keep my Commandments.* NUMB. xiv. 18. DEUT. v. 9.

^d Chap. xxxi. 29—33. ^e Chap. xi. § 19—21.

“ that

“ that you use this Proverb concerning the Land of
 “ *Israel*, saying, The Fathers have eaten four
 “ Grapes, and the Childrens Teeth are set on edge?
 “ As I live, saith the Lord God, ye shall *not have*
 “ *Occasion any more to use this Proverb in Israel.*
 “ Behold all Souls are mine, as the Soul of the Fa-
 “ ther, so also the Soul of the Son is mine: *the*
 “ *Soul that sinneth, it shall die*^f.”

And yet (to shew more plainly that the *Abroga-*
tion of the Law was solely owing to this *new* Dispen-
 sation) the same Prophets, when their Subject is the
present Jewish Oeconomy, speak of this very Law as
 still in *Force*. Thus *Jeremiah*: “ Thou shewest
 “ loving Kindness unto thousands, and *recompensest*
 “ *the Iniquity of the Fathers into the Bosom of their*
 “ *Children after them*^g.” And *Hosea*: Seeing thou
 “ *hast forgotten the Law of thy God, I will also*
 “ *forget thy Children*^h.”

From all this we conclude, that, whoever was the
 real Author of the *Mosaic Institution*, he was well
 acquainted with the *Importance* of the Doctrine of a
 future State of Reward and Punishment, and pro-
 vided well for the *Want* of it.

But the Blindness of Infidelity is here most de-
 plorable. The Deists are not content with con-
 demning *this Law of Injustice*, but will accuse the
 Dispensation itself of *Inconsistence*; pretending that
 the Prophets have directly contradicted *Moses* in
 their manner of denouncing Punishment.

It is indeed the standing Triumph of Infidelity.
But let us return (says SPINOZA) *to the Propbets,*
whose discordant Opinions we have undertaken to lay
open. — The xviiith Chap. of EZEKIEL does not seem
 to agree with the 7th v of the xxxivth Chap. of EXO-
 DUS, nor with the 18th v of the xxxii^d Chap. of

^f Chap. xviii. v 2—4.

^g Chap. xxxii. v 18.

^h Chap. iv. v 6.

JEREMIAH, &c.ⁱ. “ There are several Mistakes
 “ (says TYNDAL) crept into the Old Testament,
 “ where there’s scarce a Chapter which gives any
 “ historical Account of Matters, but there are some
 “ Things in it which could not be there originally.
 “ — It must be owned, that the same Spirit (I dare
 “ not call it a Spirit of Cruelty) does not alike pre-
 “ vail throughout the Old Testament; the nearer
 “ we come to the Times of the Gospel, the milder
 “ it appeared: For though God declares in the
 “ Decalogue, that he is *a jealous God, visiting the*
 “ *Iniquity of the Parents upon the Children to the*
 “ *third and fourth Generation*; and accordingly
 “ *Achan*, with all his Family, was destroyed for his
 “ single Crime; yet the Lord afterwards says, *The*
 “ *Soul that sinneth, it shall die; the Son shall not bear*
 “ *the Iniquity of the Father*^k, &c.

I. Let us see then what these Men have to say on the first Point, the *Injustice of the Law*. They set out on a false Supposition, that this Method of Punishment was part of an universal Religion given by God as the Creator and Governor of Mankind; whereas it is only Part of a civil Institute, given by him to *one People*, as their *tutelary God* and *civil Governor*. Now we know it to be the Practice of all States to punish the Crime of *lese Majesty* in this Manner. And to render it just, no more is required than its being in the Compact (as it was here) on Men’s free Entrance into Society.

But with infinitely more Rectitude was this Method of Punishment administered in the *Jewish Republic* than it could be in any other. For although

ⁱ — Sed ad Prophetas revertamur, quorum discrepantes opiniones etiam notare suscepimus. — Cap. saltem xviii. Ezech. non videtur convenire cum versu 7. cap. xxxiv. Exod. nec cum ver. 18. Cap. xxxii. Jer. &c. *Tract. Theologico-Pol.* p. 27, 28.

^k *Christ. as old as the Creation*, p. 240, 241.

God allowed capital Punishment to be inflicted for *lese Majesty*, on the *Person of the Offender*, by the delegated Administration of the Law; yet concerning his *Family* or *Posterity* he reserved the Inquisition to himself, and expressly forbid the Magistrate to meddle with it in the common Course of Justice. *The Fathers shall not be put to Death for the Children, neither shall the Children be put to Death for the Fathers: every Man shall be put to Death for his own Sin*¹. Yet such has been the Perversity or Stupidity of Freethinking, that this very Text itself hath been charged with contradicting the xxth Chapter of EXODUS. Now God's Appropriation of the Exercise of the Law in Question would abundantly justify the Equity of it, even supposing it had been given by him as part of an *Universal Religion*. For why was the Magistrate forbid to imitate God's Method of punishing, but because no Power less than omniscient could, in all Cases, keep clear of Injustice in such an Inquisition?

But God not only reserved this Method of Punishment to himself, but has graciously condescended to inform us, by his Prophets, *after what Manner* he was pleased to administer it. YOUR INIQUITIES (says he) AND THE INIQUITIES OF YOUR FATHERS TOGETHER, *which have burnt Incense upon the Mountains, and blasphemed me upon the Hills: therefore will I measure their former Work into their Bosom*^m. And again: “But ye say, Why? doth
“not the Son bear the Iniquity of the Father?
“When the Son hath done that which is lawful
“and right, and hath kept all my Statutes, and
“hath done them, he shall surely live — But when
“the Righteous turneth away from his Righteous-
“ness and committeth Iniquity—shall he liveⁿ?”

¹ DEUT. xxiv. 16.
19 and 24.

^m Is. lxxv. 7.

ⁿ EZEK. xviii.

But doubtless an innocent Posterity was sometimes punished, according to the Denunciation of this Law, for the Crimes of their wicked Fathers^o: as is done by modern States^p, in Attaint of Blood and Confiscation: and this with the highest Equity in both Cases.

1. In our Gothic Constitutions, the Throne being the Fountain of Honour and Source of Property, *Lands and Titles* descend *from it*, and are held as *FIEFS of it*; that is, under perpetual Obligation of Service: which Condition being violated by High Treason, those Privileges and Possessions justly become forfeit, and revert to the Crown, how much soever the Confiscation may affect an innocent Posterity in those their Fortunes which arose not from any *natural Rights*, but from *free Grace* or *arbitrary Compact*.

2. Just so it must needs be under a *Theocracy*. God supported the *Israelites* in *Judea*, by an *extraordinary* Administration of his Providence. The Consequence of which were great temporal Blessings given them on Condition, and to which they had no natural Claim; nothing therefore could be more equitable than, on the Violation of that Condition, to withdraw those *extraordinary* Blessings from the Children of a Father thus offending.

^o This appears from the Rise of that Proverb in *Israel*, *The Fathers have eaten sour Grapes, and the Childrens Teeth are set on edge*.

^p And indeed, in all Governments whatsoever, as well ancient as modern. *Cicero*, to excuse the Confiscations decreed against *Lepidus*, which affected his Children, the Nephews of *Brutus*, says to this latter: *Nec vero me fugit quàm sit acerbum, parentium scelera filiorum pœnis lui. Sed hoc PRÆCLARE LEGIBUS COMPARATUM est, ut caritas liberorum amiciores parentes reipublicæ redderet. Ep. ad Brutum liber, Ep. 12.* And again: *In qua videtur illud esse crudele, quod ad liberos, qui nihil meruerunt, pœna pervenit. SED IDEM ET ANTIQUM EST, ET OMNIUM CIVITATUM. Ep. 15.*

From all this it appears, that the excellent *Grotius* himself had a very crude and imperfect Notion of the whole Matter, when he resolved the Justice of it intirely into God's sovereign Right over his Creatures. "Deus quidem in lege Hebræis data
 "paternam impietatem in posteros se vindicaturum
 "minatur: sed ipse Jus Domini plenissimum habet, ut in res nostras, ita in vitam nostram, ut
 "munus suum, quod sine ulla causa & quovis tempore auferre cuivis quando vult potest⁹."

II. As to the second Point, the Charge of *Contradiction in the Dispensation*, we now see, that, on the contrary, these different Declarations of God's Manner of punishing in two so distant Periods, are the MOST DIVINE INSTANCE of Constancy and Uniformity in the Manifestations of eternal Wisdom; so far are they from any Indication of a *milder or severer Spirit*, as *Tyndal* with equal Insolence and Folly hath objected to Revelation. For while a *future State* was kept hid from the *Jews*, there was absolute Need of such a Law to restrain the more daring Transgressors, by working on their Instinct; but when a Doctrine was brought to Light which held them up, and continued them after Death the Objects of Divine Justice, it had then no farther Use; and was therefore reasonably to be abolished with the rest of the Judicial Laws peculiar to the *Mosaic Dispensation*. But these Men have taken it into their Heads (and what comes slowly in, will go slowly out) that it was repealed for its *Injustice*; tho' another Reason be as plainly intimated by the Prophets, as the Circumstances of those Times could possibly admit; and so plainly by *Jeremiah*, that none but such Heads could either not see or not acknowledge it. In his thirty first Chapter, foretell-

⁹ *De Jure Bel. & Pac.* vol. ii. p. 593. Ed. Barbeyrac, Amst. 1720.

ing the Coming of the NEW Dispensation, he expressly says, this Law shall be revoked: IN THOSE DAYS they shall say no more, *The Fathers have eaten a sour Grape, and the Childrens Teeth are set on edge. But every one shall die for his own Iniquity*^r. Yet, in the very next Chapter, speaking of the OLD Dispensation, under which they then lived, he as expressly declares the Law to be still in Force. *When I had delivered the Evidence of the Purchase unto Baruch, I prayed unto the Lord, saying,—Thou shewest loving Kindness unto Thousands, and recompensest the Iniquity of the Fathers into the Bosom of their Children after them*^s. Is this like a Man who had forgot himself? or who suspected the Law of Cruelty or Injustice?

But the Blindness of Infidelity was here unaffected; and indeed the more excusable, as the Matter had of old perplexed both *Jews* and *Christians*. The *Synagogue* was so scandalized at *Ezekiel's* Declarations against this Mode of Punishment, that they deliberated a long Time whether he should not be thrown out of the Canon, for contradicting *Moses* in so open a Manner^t. And Sentence had at last past upon him, but that one *Chanani*as promised to reconcile the two Prophets. How he kept his Word, is not known, for there is nothing of his extant on this Subject; only we are told that he was

^r y 29, 30. ^s y 16 and 18.

^t Les Juifs disent qu'Ezechiel étoit serviteur de Jérémie, & que le Sanhedrin delibera long-tems, si l'on rejetteroit son Livre du Canon des Ecritures. Le sujet de leur chagrin contre ce Prophete vient de son extreme obscurité, & de ce qu'il enseigne diverses choses contraires à Moïse — Ezechiel, disent ils, a déclaré, *Que le fils ne porteroit plus l'iniquité de son pere*, contre ce que Moïse dit expressement, *Que le Seigneur venge l'iniquité des Peres sur les Enfants, jusqu' à la troisieme & quatrieme generation*. Calmet, Dissert. vol. ii. p. 361.

a Man of Honour, and, with great Labour and Study, at length did the Business^v.

Origen was so puzzled with the different Assertions^w of these two Prophets, that he could find no better way of reconciling them than by supposing the Words of the first to be a *Parable* or *Mystic Speech*; which, however, he would not pretend to explain. This learned Father, having quoted some Pagan Oracles intimating that Children were punished for the Crimes of their Forefathers, goes on in this Manner: “How much more equitable is
 “ what our Scriptures say on this Point? *The Fathers*
 “ *shall not be put to Death for the Children, neither*
 “ *shall the Children be put to Death for the Fathers:*
 “ *Every Man shall be put to Death for his own Sin.*
 “ DEUT. XXIV. 16, &c. — But if any one should
 “ object that this Verse of the Oracle

“ *On the Childrens Children and their Posterity;*
 “ is very like what Scripture says, that GOD visits
 “ *the Iniquity of the Fathers upon the Children unto*
 “ *the third and fourth Generation of them that hate*
 “ *him,* EXOD. XX. 5. he may learn from *Ezekiel*
 “ that those Words are a PARABLE; for the Pro-
 “ phet reproves such as say, *The Fathers have eaten*
 “ *sour Grapes, and the Childrens Teeth are set on*
 “ *edge;* and then it follows: *As I live, saith the*
 “ *Lord, every one shall die for his own Sins only.*
 “ But this is not the Place to explain what is meant

^v Ezechielis sententias adeo sententiis Mosis repugnantes inveniunt Rabini, qui nobis illos (qui jam tantum extant) libros Prophetarum reliquerunt, ut fere deliberaverint, ejus librum inter canonicos non admittere, atque eundem plane abscondidissent, nisi quidam Chanania in se suscepisset ipsum explicare, quod tandem magno cum labore & studio (ut ibi narratur) aiunt ipsum fecisse, qua ratione autem non satis constat. — *Spinozæ Tract. Theologico-Pol.* p. 27, 28.

^w EXOD. XX. EZEK. xviii.

“ by the Parable of visiting Iniquity unto the third
“ and fourth Generation^x.”

II.

We have now shewn that *Moses* did not teach a future State of Reward and Punishment; and that he omitted it with Design: that he understood its great Importance to Society, and that he provided for the Want of it.

But as our Proof of this Point is only for the sake of its Consequence, that *therefore the People had not the Knowledge of that Doctrine*, our next Step will be to establish that Consequence. Which (together with those Circumstances explained above as attending the Omission) will, at the same Time, free our Argument from the Objection of its being merely *negative*, and produce a *positive* Proof of *Moses's* not teaching the Doctrine of a future State of Reward and Punishment.

Now though one might fairly conclude, that the People's *not having* this Doctrine was a necessary Consequence of *Moses's not teaching* it, in a Law which solemnly forbids the least Addition^y to the written Institution; yet I shall shew, from a Circumstance the most clear and incontestable, that the *Israelites*, from the Time of *Moses* to the Time

^x Ὅρα ὅτι ὅσα τέτρα βέλιον τὸ, οὐκ ἀποθανῆναι, ἔσ. εἰ δέ τις ὁμοιον εἶ) λέγει τῷ

Ἐς παίδων παῖδας οἱ καὶ ὅτι οὐδὲν γινώσκουσιν,
τὸ, Ἀποδιδὼς ἀμαρτίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα, ἐπὶ τρίτῳ καὶ τετάρτῳ
γενεῶν τοῖς μισοῦσιν [με] μαθέτω, ὅτι ἐν τῷ Ἰεζεκιήλ ἀπαβολὴ τὸ
τοιοῦτον εἶ) λέλεκται, αἰτιωρῶν τὰς λέγοντας, οἱ πατέρες ἔφαλον ὁμφα-
κα, καὶ οἱ ὀδόντες τὰ τέκνων ἠμωδίασαν· αἱ ἐπιφέρειαι, Ζῶ ἐγὼ, λέγει
Κύριος, ἀλλ' ἢ ἕκαστος τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ἀμαρτίᾳ ἀποθανεῖται, καὶ ἕ) τὸ
παρὸν καὶ καὶ ἐν ἐστὶ, διηγήσατο τί σημαίνει ἡ παρὸν καὶ
τετάρτῳ γενεῶν ἀποδίδωσιν τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἀπαβολή. Cont. Cels.
p. 403.

^y DEUT. iv. 2. Chap. xii. § 32.

of their Captivity, had not the Doctrine of a future State of Reward and Punishment.

The Bible contains a very circumstantial History of this People throughout the aforesaid Period; not only public Occurrences, but the private Adventures of Persons of both Sexes, and of all Ages and Stations, of all Characters and Complexions; in the Lives of Virgins, Matrons, Kings, Soldiers, Scholars, Merchants, Husbandmen. They are given too in every Circumstance of Life, victorious, captive, sick and in Health; in full Security, and amidst impending Dangers; plunged in civil Business, or retired and sequestered in the Service of Religion. Together with their Story, we have their Compositions likewise. Here they sing their Triumphs, there their Palinodia. Here they urge their moral Precepts, and there the Promises and Denunciations of Heaven. Yet in none of these different Circumstances of Life, in none of these various Casts of Composition, do we ever find them acting on the Motives, or influenced by the Prospect of a future State; or indeed expressing the least Hopes or Fears, or even common Curiosity concerning it. But every Thing they do or say respects the present Life only; the Good and Ill of which are the sole Objects of all their Pursuits and Aversions.

Hear then the Sum of all. The sacred Writings are extremely various both in their Subject, Style and Composition. They contain an Account of the Creation, and Original of the human Race; the History of a private Family, of a chosen People, and of exemplary Men and Women. They consist of Hymns and Petitions to the Deity, Precepts of civil Life, and religious Prophecies and Predictions. Hence I infer that as, amidst all this Variety of Writing, the Doctrine of a future State
never

never once appears to have had any Share in the Peoples Thoughts ; it never did indeed make part of their religious Opinions^z.

But to set this Argument in its fullest Light ; let us consider the History of the rest of Mankind, whether recorded by Bards, or Statesmen ; by Phi-

^z We shall now understand the Importance of a Remark, which the learned Translator of *Josephus* employs to prove the Genuineness of a Fragment or Homily given by him to that Historian: " There is one particular Observation (says he) belonging to the Contents of this Fragment or Homily, that seems to me to be DECRETORY, and to determine the Question that some of this *Jewish* Church that used the *Hebrew* Copy of the Old Testament, nay rather that *Josephus* himself in particular was the Author of it. The Observation is this, that in the present Address to the *Greeks* or *Gentiles* there are near forty References or Allusions to Texts of the New Testament ; AND NOT ONE TO ANY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT either in *Hebrew* or *Greek* ; and this in a Discourse concerning HADES ; which yet is almost five Times as often mentioned in the *Old* Testament as in the *New*. What can be the Reason of this ? But that the *Jewish* Church at *Jerusalem* used the *Hebrew* Bible alone, which those *Greeks* or *Gentiles*, to whom the Address is here made, could not understand ; and that our *Josephus* always and only used the same *Hebrew* Bible ? " *Mr. Whiston's Dissert.* prefixed to his *Transl. of Josephus*, p. 105. — *What can be the Reason* (says he) *of this Mystery ?* He unfolds it thus: *The Jewish Church of Jerusalem used the Hebrew Bible alone, which those Greeks or Gentiles, to whom the Address is here made, could not understand.* So that because the Audience did not understand *Hebrew*, the Preacher could not quote the Texts, he had Occasion for, in *Greek*. But he supposes he could not quote the *Greek*, because it must needs have been that of the *Septuagint* ; which the *Jewish* Christians of *Jerusalem* would not use. Now admit there was no other *Greek* to be had, or allowed of, can any Man believe that if this *Jewish* Preacher would turn himself to the *Gentiles*, he could be such a Bigot as to be afraid of quoting the Old Testament in a Language they understood, because his Church used only the Original which they understood not ? Or if he had been such a Bigot, would he have dared to preach to the *Gentiles* at all ? What then but the Fondness for an Hypothesis could make Men ramble after such Reasons, when so obvious an one lies just before

losophers,

losophers, or Priests: In which we shall find the *Doctrine of a future State* bearing, throughout all the various Circumstances of human Life, a constant and principal Share in the Determinations of the Will.

But not to be distracted by too large a View, let us select from the rest of the Nations one or two most resembling the *Jewish*. Those that came nearest to them, and, if the *Jews* were only under human Guidance, indeed extremely near, were the *Suevi* of the North, and the *Arabs* of the South. Both these People were led out in Search of new Possessions which they were to win with the Sword. And both, it is confessed, had the *Doctrine of a future State* inculcated unto them by their Leaders ODIN and MAHOMET. Of the *Arabs* we have a large and circumstantial History: Of the *Suevi* only some few Fragments of the Songs and Ballads of their Bards; yet they equally serve to support our Conclusion. In the large History of the *Saracen Empire* we can scarce find a Page, and in the *Runic Rhymes* of the *Suevi* scarce a Line, where the *Doctrine of a future State* was not pushing on its Influence. It was their constant Viaticum through Life; it stimulated them to War, and spirited their

them? Why did he this, do you ask? For this plain Reason: His Subject was a *future State of Reward and Punishment*, and he had more Sense than to seek for it where it was not to be found. Oh, but HADES is almost five Times as often mentioned in the *Old Testament* as in the *New*. Indeed! But the Fragment is not about the *Word*, but the *Thing*. In the *Old Testament* it signified the Receptacle of *dead Bodies*; in the *New*, the Receptacle of *living Souls*. But though this learned Writer can, without doubt, laugh at those who seek the *Trinity* in the *Old Testament*, yet he can in good earnest go thither in search of a *future State*. Yet this latter is not in any Comparison so clearly hinted at as the other: And no wonder; a *future State* is circumscribed to the *New Testament*, as brought to Light by the Gospel; but not so circumscribed is the *Doctrine of the Trinity*.

Songs

Songs of Triumph; it made them insensible of Pain, and superior to the Hour of Death. What *Cicero* says of *Poetry* in *Rome*, may be more truly applied to the Doctrine of a future State amongst these Barbarians: “*Ceteræ neque temporum sunt,*
 “*neque ætatum omnium, neque locorum. Hæc*
 “*studia Adolescentiam alunt, senectutem oblectant,*
 “*secundas res ornant, adversis perfugium ac sola-*
 “*tium præbent*^a.”

But this is not all. For we find that when a future State became a popular Doctrine amongst the *Jewish* People (the Time and Occasion of which will be explained hereafter) that then it made as considerable a Figure in their Annals, by influencing their Determinations, as it did in the History of any other People.

Nor is it only on the *negative Silence* of the sacred Writers, or of the Speakers they introduce, that we support our Conclusion; but from their *positive Declarations*; in which they plainly discover there was no popular Expectation of a *future State*, or *Resurrection*. Thus the Woman of *Tekoah* to *David*: *For we must needs die, and are as Water spilt on the Ground, which cannot be gathered up again*^b. Thus *Job*: *As the Cloud is consumed, and vanisheth away: so he that goeth down to the Grave shall come up no more*^c. And again: “There is Hope of a Tree,
 “if it be cut down, that it will sprout again —
 “though the Root thereof wax old in the Earth,
 “and the Stock thereof die in the Ground, yet
 “through the Scent of Water, it will bud and bring
 “forth Boughs like a Plant. But Man dieth and
 “wasteth away: yea, Man giveth up the Ghost, and
 “where is he? As the Waters fail from the Sea,
 “and the Flood decayeth and drieth up: so Man

^a *Pro Archia Poeta*, Sect. 7. ^b 2 SAM. xiv. 14.

^c Chap. vii. § 9.

“ lieth down and riseth not till the Heavens be no
 “ more, they shall not awake nor be raised out of
 “ their Sleep ^d. ”

The Psalmist says, *In Death there is no Remembrance of thee: in the Grave who shall give thee Thanks ^e?* And again: *What Profit is there in my Blood, when I go down to the Pit? Shall the Dust praise thee, shall it declare thy Truth ^f?* And again,
 “ Wilt thou shew Wonders to the Dead? Shall
 “ the Dead arise and praise thee? Shall thy loving
 “ Kindness be declared in the Grave, or thy Faith-
 “ fulness in Destruction? Shall thy Wonders be
 “ known in the Dark? and thy Righteousness in
 “ the Land of Forgetfulness ^g? ”

The Writer of the Book of *Ecclesiastes* is still more exprefs: *For the Living know that they shall die: but the Dead know not any Thing, neither have they any more a REWARD, for the Memory of them is forgotten ^h.*

Hezekiah, in his Song of Thanksgiving for his miraculous Recovery, speaks in the very same Strain:
 “ For the Grave cannot praise thee, Death cannot
 “ celebrate thee: they that go down into the Pit
 “ cannot hope for thy Truth. The living, the
 “ living, he shall praise thee, as I do this Day:
 “ The Father to the Children shall make known
 “ thy Truth ⁱ. ”

Lastly *Jeremiah* in his *Lamentations* and Complaints of the People says: OUR FATHERS HAVE SINNED AND ARE NOT, AND WE HAVE BORN THEIR INIQUITIES ^k. Which implies, that the Fathers being dead bore no Part of the Punishment of their Sins, but that all was thrown upon the Children. But could this have been supposed,

^d Chap. xiv. § 7—12.

^e Ps. vi. 5.

^f Ps. xxx. 9.

^g PsAL. lxxxviii. 10—12.

^h Chap. ix. § 5.

ⁱ Is. xxxviii. 18, 19.

^k Chap. v. § 7.

had the People been instructed in the Doctrine of future Rewards and Punishments?

Thus 'tis, we see, the same Language throughout, and in every Circumstance of Life; as well in the *cool Philosophy* of the Author of *Ecclesiastes*, as amidst the *Distresses* of the *Psalmist*, and the *Exultations* of good *Hezekiah*.

Now could this Language have been used by a People instructed in the Doctrine of Life or Immortality? Or do we find one Word of it, on any Occasion whatsoever, in the Writers of the New Testament, but where 'tis brought in to be confuted and condemned?

All this, to thoughtful Men, will, I doubt not, be deemed convincing. Whence it follows that that Subterfuge is quite cut off, which pretends, that *Moses* did not indeed propagate the Doctrine of a future State in *Writing*, but that he delivered it to *Tradition*¹, which conveyed it safely down through all the Ages, from one End of the *Jewish* Dispensation to the other. For we see he was so far from teaching it, that he studiously contrived to keep it out of Sight, nay provided for the Want of it: and the People so far from being *influenced* by it, that they had not even the *Idea* of it.

¹ Mons. Simon avoit dit, *pour appuyer la Tradition*, que la resurrection des corps ne peut se demontrer par le Vieux Testament—ces expressions plus claires de la resurrection & du siecle à venir, qui se trouvent dans le *second Livre des Maccabees*, sont une preuve evidente que les Juifs avoient une Tradition touchant la Resurrection, dont il n'est fait aucune mention dans les anciens livres de l'Ecriture. Les Protestans & les Sociniens qui ne reçoivent point les *Maccabees* ne pourront pas la prouver solidement par le Vieux Testament. *Pere Simon, Reponse au Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande*, &c. p. 39.

S E C T. VI.

BUT what is of greatest Weight, the inspired Writers of the *New Testament* expressly declare the same. They assure that the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments did NOT make part of the *Mosaic Dispensation*.

Their Evidence may be divided into *two* Parts; the *first* proving that *temporal* Rewards and Punishments were the *Sanction* of the *Jewish Dispensation*: the *second*, that it had NO OTHER.

I. St. PAUL, in his Epistle to *Timothy*, enforcing the Advantages of *Moral* above *Ritual* Observances against certain Judaizing Christians, says, “*Bodily Exercise* profiteth little; but Godliness is profitable unto all Things; having the Promise of *the Life that now is, and of that which is to come^m.*” That is, though numerous *ritual Observances* were enjoined by the *Law*, and some there must needs be under the *Gospel* wherever there is a *Christian Church*, yet they are of little Advantage in Comparison of *Moral Observances*: which, under both Religions, had the *proper* Reward of each, annexed to them only; namely, under the *Jewish*, the Reward of *the Life that now is*; under the *Christian*, of that *which is to come*. That this is the Meaning of the Text, and consequently that the Words *the Life that now is* do not relate to the *Christian Dispensation*, I prove,

I. From other Passages of the same Writer, where he expressly informs us that *Christians* have not the Promise of the *Life that now is*. For to the *Corinthians* he says, speaking of the Condition of

^m 1 TIM. iv. 8.

the Followers of CHRIST, *If in this Life only we have Hope in CHRIST, we are of all Men most miserable*ⁿ. To understand the Force of these Words, we must consider, that they were addressed to *Jewish Converts* tainted with *Sadducism*, who argued from the *Mosaic Oeconomy* to the *Christian*. And holding that there was no future State in the former, concluded by Analogy, that there was none in the latter. The Argument on which they built their first Position was, that the *Sanction* of the Law were *temporal* Rewards and Punishments. Our Apostle therefore argues with them, as is his usual Way, on their own Principles. “ You deny, says he, a
 “ Resurrection from the Dead, or a future State of
 “ Reward and Punishment. And why ? Because
 “ there is no such Doctrine in the *Law*. How do
 “ you prove it ? Because the *Sanction* of the Law
 “ are temporal Rewards and Punishments. Agreed.
 “ And now on your own Principle I confute your
 “ Conclusion. You own that the *Jews* had an
 “ Equivalent for *future* Reward and Punishment,
 “ namely the *Present*. But *Christians* have no
 “ Equivalent. So far from that, *they are*, with
 “ regard to this World only, *of all Men most mi-*
 “ *serable* ; having therefore no Equivalent for the
 “ Rewards of a future State, they must needs be
 “ entitled to them.” This shews us the exceeding Force of the Apostle’s Reasoning. And from hence it appears not only that *Christians had not*, but that the *Jews had* the Promise of the Life that now is.

2. Interpreting the *Promise of the Life that now is* to the *Christian Dispensation*, destroys the Strength and Integrity of St. *Paul’s* Argument. He is here

reasoning against *Judaizing Christians*. So that his Business is to shew, that *Godliness*, in every State and under every Dispensation which they imagined themselves bound unto, had the Advantage of *bodily Exercise*.

The Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* speaking of JESUS says: *After the Similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another Priest, who is made not after the LAW OF A CARNAL COMMANDMENT, but after the Power of an endless Life*^o. The Jewish Religion, called a *carnal Commandment*, is here opposed to the *Christian*, called *the Power of an endless Life*. By carnal Commandment then must needs be understood a Law promising carnal Things, or the Things of this Life.

II. That the *Mosaic* Dispensation had ONLY the *Sanction* of *temporal* Rewards and Punishments, or that it taught not *future*, to this Part, let us once again hear the learned Apostle: *As by one Man* (says he) *Sin entered into the World, and Death by Sin; and so Death passed upon all Men, for that all have sinned: For until the Law Sin was in the World, but Sin is not imputed where there is no Law. Nevertheless Death reigned from Adam to Moses*^p. It is St. Paul's Purpose to shew, that *Death* came by *Adam* through Sin, and so passed upon all Men; and that *Life* came by JESUS CHRIST. But having said that Sin, which brings forth Death, is not imputed where there is no Law, lest this should seem to contradict what he had said of Death's passing upon *all Men*, he adds, *nevertheless Death reigned from Adam to Moses*; taking it for granted that his Followers would understand it must needs reign from *Moses* to CHRIST as having made *Sin's* being

^o Chap. vii. § 15, 16.

^p ROM. v. 12, & seq.

imputed

imputed to consist in there being a *Law* given. Now I ask how the Apostle could possibly say, *that Death reigned under the Mosaic Dispensation*, if that People had the Knowledge of immortal Life to be procured by a *Redeemer to come*, any more than it can be said to reign *now* with the same Knowledge of a *Redeemer past*; since we agree that the Efficacy of his Death extends to all preceding as well as succeeding Ages? Accordingly in his Epistle to the *Corinthians* he calls the *Jewish Law*, the MINISTRATION OF DEATH, and the MINISTRATION OF CONDEMNATION^q.

2. In his second Epistle to *Timothy* he expressly says, *That JESUS CHRIST HATH ABOLISHED DEATH, AND HATH BROUGHT LIFE AND IMMORTALITY TO LIGHT THROUGH THE GOSPEL^r*. But now if Death were abolished by JESUS CHRIST, it is certain it had reigned till his Coming: And yet it is as certain, that it could reign no longer than while the Tidings of the Gospel were kept back, because we agree that CHRIST's Death hath a retrospect Operation: Therefore those under the Law had no Knowledge of Life and Immortality. Again: *If Life and Immortality were brought to Light through the Gospel*, it was consequently, till the preaching of the Gospel, kept hid and out of sight. But if taught by *Moses* and the Prophets, it was not brought to Light through the Gospel: Therefore the generality of those under the Law had no Knowledge of a future State. But Scripture is ever consistent, though Mens Systems be not. And for this Reason we find that *Life and Immortality*, which is here said to be *brought to Light through the Gospel*, is so often called the MYSTERY OF THE GOSPEL^s: That is, a *Mystery*

^q 2 COR. iii. 7, & seq.^r 2 TIM. i. 10.^s EPH. vi. 19.

till this Promulgation of it by the Disciples of CHRISIT. Which had been hid from Ages and from Generations, but was then made manifest unto the Saints^t. The Term was borrowed from those famous Rites of Paganism so named; and applied with admirable Justness. For as the *Mysteries* were communicated only to a Few of the Wise and Great, and kept hid from the Populace: So *Life and Immortality*, as we shall see, was revealed by God, as a special Favour, to the holy Patriarchs and Prophets, but kept hid from the Body of the Jewish Nation.

3. The Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* says: That THE LAW MADE NOTHING PERFECT, BUT THE BRINGING IN OF A BETTER HOPE DID^v. But *that* could not be said to be brought in, which was *there* before. And had it been there before, the *Law*, it seems, had been perfect; and, consequently, would have superseded the Use of the Gospel. Therefore this *better Hope*, namely of Immortality in a future State, is not in the *Mosaic Dispensation*. Let us observe farther, that as the Gospel, by bringing in a *better Hope*, made the *Law perfect*, it appears there was that Relation between the *Law* and *Gospel* as is between the *Beginning* and the *Completion* of any Matter. From whence these two Consequences follow: 1. That the Law wanted something which the Gospel supplied: and what was that but the Doctrine of a future State? 2. That the Law must needs make *some Preparation* for that *better Hope* which the Gospel was to bring in. What it was, the same Writer tells us, namely, That it had A SHADOW [σκιάν] of good Things to come, but not the VERY IMAGE [εἰκόνα] of the Things^w. Hence it is evident

^t COL. i. 26.^v Chap. vii. § 19.^w Chap. x. § 1.

that by this *Shadow* is meant such a *typical* Representation, so faintly delineated, as not to be perceived by vulgar Eyes, intent only on a carnal Dispensation. And this, for admirable Purposes: For if, instead of a *Shadow* or faint Out-lines of a Design, the Image itself, in full Relief, had glaringly held forth the Thing intended, an Object, so distinctly defined, would have drawn the *Jews* from that Oeconomy to which it was God's Pleasure they should long continue in Subjection: and had there been no *Shadow* at all, to become stronger in a clearer Light, one illustrious Evidence of the *Dependency* between the two Religions, had been wanting.

Again, the same Writer, to the same Purpose, speaking of CHRIST says, *But now hath he obtained a more excellent Ministry, by how much also he is the Mediator of a better Covenant, which was established upon better Promises. For if the first Covenant had been faultless, then should no Place have been found for the second* ^x. 1. We see that this better Covenant was established by CHRIST, and not by *Moses*. 2. If the first Covenant had been faultless, that is, had contained a *better Hope*, or taught the Doctrine of a future State, there had been no Room for a second. Which is so true, that, had the *Mosaic* Religion taught Life and Immortality, though it had made present Rewards and Punishments the proper and peculiar Sanction of the Law, the *first* Covenant had not only been faultless, but even far more excellent than the *second*: as having in it, what the second had not, *the Promise of the Life that now is, and of that which is come*.

But now perhaps it may be objected, That my Point is to prove that this Dispensation had *no future*

^x Chap. viii. y 6, 7.

State at all, and my Evidence, from the New Testament, only shews they had not the *Christian Doctrine of it*. To which I answer, 1. That those I argue with, if they hold any Difference between the *Christian* and *general* Doctrine of a future State, it is only this, that the *Christian* Doctrine was *revealed*, the other, a Conclusion of natural Reason. Now if the *Jews* had this Doctrine, they must needs have it, as *revealed*; consequently the same with the *Christian*. 2. That though I myself suppose the *general* and *Christian* Doctrine of a future State of Reward and Punishment to be very different Things; yet I shall shew, in due Time, that if *Moses* were indeed God's Messenger, and would teach a future State, it could be no other than the *Christian Doctrine* of it.

Thus, I presume, I have proved beyond all reasonable Doubt, *that the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments is not to be found in, nor did make Part of the Mosaic Dispensation.*

It will be asked then, what were the real Sentiments of these early *Jews* concerning the Soul? Though the Question be a little out of Time, yet as the Answer is short, I shall not defer giving it: They were doubtless the same with those of the rest of Mankind, who have thought upon the Matter; that IT SURVIVED THE BODY. But having from *Moses's* Silence, and Establishment of another Sanction, no Expectation of future Rewards and Punishments, they simply concluded that *it returned to him who gave it*. But, as to *interesting* Speculations concerning its State of Survivorship, 'tis plain they had not any. All this appears from the Book of *Ecclesiastes*, which speaks the Sentiments of the *Jews* of that Time: *Who knoweth* (says this Author) *the Spirit of Man that goeth upward, and the Spirit of the Beast that goeth downward to the Earth?*

Earth y? And again: "Then shall the Dust
 "return to the Earth as it was, AND THE SPI-
 "RIT SHALL RETURN UNTO GOD WHO GAVE
 "IT z." Yet this Writer, perfectly conformable
 to what I here deliver, says, at the same Time:
But the Dead know not any Thing, neither have
they ANY MORE A REWARD, for the Memory of
them is forgotten a.

y Chap. iii. y 21. Vid. *Cleric. & Drusium* in loc.

z Chap. xii. y 7. Vid. *Clericum* in loc.

a Chap. ix. y 5.

B O O K VI.

S E C T. I.

AFTER such convincing Evidence of a future State's not making Part of the Religion of *Moses*, the Reader would scarce imagine he must be once more stopt to hear a tedious Answer to a Set of Texts brought from the *Old* and *New* Testament to prove, *That the Doctrine of a future State of Reward and Punishment did make the most essential Part of the Mosaic Dispensation*: and this not by a few fanciful Allegorists, or outrageous Bigots only, who will say or do any thing, but by many sober Men of all Sects and Parties, of all Times, and of all Religions.

I. Several of the *ancient* CHRISTIAN Writers were so persuaded of this Point, that not content to say the Doctrine of a future State made Part of the *Mosaic* Dispensation, they would be confident that the very Pagans learnt it all from thence. Some modern *Christians* have not been behind them in their *Faith*, but have far outstripped them in their *Charity*, while they treated the Denial of it as a new Species of *Infidelity*. It is true they are all extremely confused and inconstant in the Way they represent it to have been taught: And there have not been wanting, at all Times, Men of greatest Eminence for Parts and Piety, who have not only doubted, but plainly *denied* a future State to be in the *Mosaic* Religion; though, to be just, with the same Obscurity and Embarras that the others have maintained

maintained it^a. However, the more current Doctrine hath always been, *that a future State of Rewards and Punishments was taught by the Law of Moses.*

As surprizing as this may seem to those who have weighed the foregoing Evidence, yet indeed no less could be expected from such a Number of odly concurrent Prejudices that have served, till now, to discredit one of the most momentous Truths that Revelation hath to boast of.

1. The first was, that several *Patriarchs* and *Prophets*, both before and under the *Mosaic* Dispensation, were certainly favoured with the Revelation of Man's *Redemption*, in which the Doctrine of a future State is so eminently contained; and they think it utterly incredible that these should not have conveyed it to their Posterity and People.

2. They could not conceive how a Religion could be worthy of God, which did not propose to its Followers a future State of Rewards and Punishments; but confined their Views to the carnal Things of this Life only.

3. The Truth here contended for had been received and *abused* by the Enemies of all true Religion and Godliness; such as the *Sadducees* of the old *Jewish* Church, the *Gnostics* of the old *Christian*, and *Unbelievers* in all Churches.

4. Lastly, Men were kept fast within the Error into which these Prejudices had drawn them, by never rightly distinguishing between a future State as taught by what Men call *Natural Religion*, and a

^a To give an Example only in Bishop Bull, whose *Latin* Words for a Future State's not being in the *Mosaic* Dispensation are quoted at p. 587; yet in an *English* posthumous Sermon, he seems to speak in a very different manner. — I should not have illustrated this Censure by the Example of so excellent a Person, had not the Indiscretion of a wretched Scribler thus forced it from me.

future State as taught by *Christian Revelation*; which is the CLUE, as we shall see hereafter, to conduct us through all the Errors and Perplexities of this *Region of Darkness*, till we come into the glorious *Sanctuary of God*.

II. But this Error, as we said, is not confined to the *Christian Church*. The *Jews* too maintain it with equal Obstinacy, but not with equal Indiscretion: *The Children of THIS WORLD are, in their Generation, wiser than the Children of LIGHT*^b; their fatal Adherence to long abolished *Judaism* depending altogether upon this single Prejudice. For the Consequence is inevitable, if *Moses* taught *not* a future State, his Religion could be only *preparatory* to one that *did*. This therefore is their great Support; and *wisely* have they enforced it by all the Authority and Power of the Synagogue^c. But what *Christians* gain by it, I confess I know not. What they lose, will be seen hereafter: Not only *one* Demonstration of the Truth of the *Mosaic Mission*, but *all* true Conception of that divine Harmony which inspires each Part, and runs throughout the whole of God's grand Dispensation to Mankind.

III. The Error is still more extensive; and hath spread from *true* Religion to the *false*, a fitter Province for its Residence. For the *MAHOMETANS*, who hold the Divinity of the Law, are as obstinate as the best, in giving it this mistaken Advantage. But, it must be owned, with a more ingenuous Pretence. Their Expedient for saving the Honour of the *Law* is this: They confess the Doctrine of a future State is not at present to be found there: BUT THOUGH IT BE NOT THERE, IT OUGHT TO BE; for, that the *Jews*, in pure Spite to them, have in-

^b LUKE xvi. 8.^c See the *Dedication*.

terpolated their Bible, and struck out all mention of it^d.

Matters being in this odd Situation, the Reader will excuse me if I stop a little to consider those Texts of Scripture, which *Christian* Writers have produced to prove, *that a future State of Rewards and Punishments makes Part of the Mosaic Religion.*

II.

But here let me observe, that the Thing of most Consequence, in this Part of my Discourse, will be only to state the Question truly and plainly. And then every common Reader will be able, without my Help, to answer these Objectors. Or rather the Question thus truly stated, will be a full Answer to them beforehand.

I. My declared Purpose, in this Work^e, was to demonstrate *the Divine Legation of MOSES*, in order to use it as Part of the Foundation of a projected Defence of *Christianity*. This I do by the Medium of *no future State of Reward and Punishment in the Mosaic Dispensation*. I must needs therefore go upon these two Principles: 1. That *Moses* did *not* disbelieve a future State of Reward and Punishment. 2. That *his Religion* was *preparative* to *that of JESUS*, which *taught* it. Hence arise these Consequences:

^d *Taourat* — Les Musulmans disent, que c'est l'ancien Testament que Dieu revela à Moïse, écrit en langue Hébraïque, livre qui a été altéré & corrompu par les Juifs. — C'est là le sentiment des Musulmans qui a été recueilli de plusieurs auteurs Arabes par *Hagi Khalfab*. Le même auteur dit — que l'on n'y trouve pas aussi aucun endroit où il soit parlé de l'autre vie, ni de la Résurrection, ni du Paradis, ni de l'Enfer, & que cela vient peut-être de ce que les Juifs ont corrompu leurs exemplaires. — *Voyez la Bibliothèque Orientale de M. D'Herbelot, Mot. TAOURAT.*

^e See the Append. to the first Edit. of the *Alliance between Church and State*.

1. From my holding that *Moses* did *not* disbelieve a Future State, it follows, that all such Texts of Scripture as are brought to prove that the ancient *Jews* believed *the Soul survived the Body*, are nothing to the Purpose: but do, on the contrary, greatly support my Opinion. For which Reason I have myself shewn, that the early *Jews* did indeed suppose this Truth.

2. From my holding that the Religion of *Moses* was only preparatory to that of *JESUS*, it follows, that all such Texts as imply a *future State of Rewards and Punishments* in their TYPICAL Signification only, are just as little to the Purpose. For if *Moses's* Religion was preparatory to one *future*, it is, as I have shewn^f, highly reasonable to suppose, that the essential Doctrine of that *new* Religion was *shadowed* out under the Rites, or by the inspired Penmen of the *old*. But such Texts are not only inconclusive, but a Demonstration of the Opinion they are brought to oppose. For if future Rewards and Punishments were taught to the *People* under the Law, what occasion for any *typical* Representation of them, which necessarily implies the throwing things into Shade, and secreting them from vulgar Knowledge?

Both these sorts of Texts, therefore, are utterly impertinent against all but *Sadducees* and *Infidels*. Yet hath this Matter been so little attended to, in the Judgments past upon my Attempt, that these Texts have been urged as Confutations of it. I speak not here of the dirty Calumnies of one or two forgotten Scriblers, but of the unequitable Censures of some who deserve better to be set right. And now when we have taken away all these Texts from the Objectors, what have they left to keep up the Quarrel?

II. But farther, as my Position is, *that a future State of Reward and Punishment was not taught in the Mosaic Dispensation*, all Texts brought to prove

^f See the last Sect. of this Vol.

the Knowledge of it after the Time of *David* are as impertinent as the rest. For what was known *after* this Time, could not supply the Want of what was unknown for so many Ages *before*. This therefore puts all the *Prophetic* Writings out of the Question.

And now should I be so strictly severe as to insist on the common Rights of Authors, of not being obliged to answer to convict Impertinencies, this Part of my Work would be ended ere it was well begun. I shall therefore, in Charity, consider these Texts such as they are. But that I may not be thought quite so absurd as the Urgers of them, I shall give the Reader my Reasons for so doing.

I. As to the *separate Existence of the Soul*, we should distinguish between the Mention of it by *Moses*, and by following Writers. They might, and, as we have shewn, did draw this Conclusion from the Nature of the Thing. But *Moses*, who, we suppose, intentionally omitted the Mention of a future State of Reward and Punishment, we must needs suppose too would not *proclaim* the preparatory Doctrine of the separate Existence of the Soul: nor could he, on the other hand, deny what he knew to be the Truth. Thus being necessitated to speak of *Enoch's Translation*, it could not be but that a separate Existence might be inferred, how obscurely soever the Story was delivered. But had the Words, in his Account of Man's Creation, that he *was created in the Image of God*, and that God *breathed into his Nostrils the Breath of Life*, literally signified the *Immortality* of the Soul, then must *Moses* be supposed, purposely, to have inculcated that Immortality; contrary to what we hold that he purposely omitted the Doctrine built upon it, namely a future State of Reward and Punishment. It will not be improper

improper therefore to shew that such Texts have not this pretended Meaning.

2. Concerning a future State of Reward and Punishment; several Texts are brought as teaching it in a *typical* Sense, which teach it in *no Sense at all*: several as teaching it in a *direct* and *literal* Sense, which only teach it in a *typical*. Both these, therefore, it may be proper to set in a true Light.

3. Lastly, Concerning the Texts from the later Prophets, which are *without* the Period in Question; I own, and it is incumbent on my Argument to prove, that these Prophets opened the first dawning of the Doctrine of a *Resurrection*, and consequently of a future State of Reward and Punishment: Even these therefore shall in their proper Place, in the next Volume, be carefully considered.

S E C T. II.

HAVING premised thus much to clear the Way, and shorten the Inquiry, I now proceed to my Examination.

And first, of the *Text* brought from the OLD TESTAMENT.

Now as the Book of JOB is supposed to teach both a *separate Existence* and a *future State*; and is besides thought by some to be the first of *Moses's* Writings; and by others to be written even before his Time, and by the Patriarch himself, I shall give it the Precedence in this Inquiry: which it deserves likewise on another Account, the superior Evidence it bears to the Point in Question; if indeed it bears any Evidence at all. For it may be said by those who thus hold it to be the earliest Scripture (allowing the Words of *Job*, *I know that my Redeemer liveth*, &c. to respect a future State) that the *Jewish* People must not only have had the Knowledge

ledge of a *future State of Rewards and Punishments*, but, what is more, of the *Resurrection of the Body*, and still more, of the *Redemption* of Mankind by the Son of God: therefore *Moses* had no need to inculcate the Doctrine of a future State. But I much suspect the clear Knowledge of so sublime a Mystery, which *St. Paul* says *had been hid from Ages, and from Generations, but was now* (on the preaching the Gospel) *made manifest to the Saints*^e, was not at all suited to the Times of *Job* or *Moses*. The learned and impartial Divine will perhaps be more inclined to think, that either the Book of *Job* was written in a much later Age, or that this famous Passage has a very different Meaning. I shall endeavour to shew, that neither of these Suspicions are ill grounded.

I.

First then concerning the Book itself.

As to the Person of *Job*, the Eminence of his Character, his Fortitude and Patience in Afflictions, and his preceding and subsequent Felicity, these are Realities so unquestionable, that a Man must have set aside sacred Antiquity before he can admit a Doubt concerning them. But that the Book which bears *Job's* Name was written by him, or in any Age near his own, a careful and capable Examiner will, I persuade myself, be hardly brought to believe.

In the Order of this Discourse therefore, I shall inquire,

I. What kind of *Composition* the Book of *Job* really is.

II. In what *Age* it was written. And,

III. Who was its *Author*.

I. Even those who are inclined to suppose this Work of the highest Antiquity, and to think it an

^e COL. i. 26.

exact historical Relation of *Job's* Sufferings and Patience, and of God's extraordinary Dispensations towards him, recorded by his own Hand, are yet forced to own that the *Introduction* and *Conclusion* are of another Nature, and added, by a later Writer, to give that *Fulness* and *Integrity* to the Piece, which Works of Imagination, and only such Works, require. This is a large Concession, plainly intimating that he who wrote the *Prologue* and *Epilogue*, either himself believed it a *dramatic* Composition; or, at least, designed that others should so believe it. I shall therefore the less scruple to espouse the Opinion of those who conclude the WHOLE to be DRAMATICAL. For the transferring the *Prologue* and *Epilogue* to a later Writer was only an Expedient to get rid of a Circumstance which shewed it to be such a kind of Work; and which consequently brought it down to an Age remote from that of the Subject. But those who contrived this Expedient seem to have had but a slender Idea of the ancient *Drama*, which was generally rounded with a Prologue and Epilogue of this sort; to give, by way of Narrative, Information of such Facts as fell not within the Compass of the one entire Action represented.

I am induced to embrace this Opinion from the Cast of the *Style*, *Sentiments*, and *Composition*; all perfectly suited to such a kind of Work, and ill agreeing with any other.

1. As to the *Style*, it hath been observed by the Critics, even from the Time of St. *Jerom*, that all but the Introduction and Conclusion is in Measure. But as it was the Custom of Antiquity to write their gravest Works of *Religion*, *Laws*, and *History* in Verse, this Circumstance *alone* should, I think, have little Share in determining the Nature of the Composition.

2. But

2. But when we take the *Sentiments* along, and find throughout not only *Verse* but *Poetry*, a Poetry animated by all the Sublimity of Figures and Floridness of Description; and on the coolest and most abstract Subject; we cannot chuse but conclude the whole to be a Work of Imagination. Nor is it any Answer to say, that this is owing to the Genius of an *Eastern Writer*, whose kindling Fancy warms all his Thoughts into a Glow of Expression: For if the two *Ends* be his who wrote the *Middle*, as we have no Reason to doubt, they shew him not unused to the very plainest Form of Narration. And as to that *Eastern Genius* itself, tho' distinguishingly great when fired by the Enthusiasm of a poetic Vein, yet on a mere historic Subject nothing can be more cool and simple; as all acquainted either with their ancient or modern Writers can inform us. But, what is more to our Purpose, the sacred Prophets themselves, tho' wrapt in Ecstasy of the Divine Impressions, when treating of the Subject here debated, namely, *Whether and wherefore the Good are sometimes unhappy and the Bad prosperous*, a Subject that came sometimes in their Way, while opposing the Objections of impious and impatient *Jews*, who by their repeated Apostasies had now provoked God to withdraw from them, by Degrees, his extraordinary Providence; when, I say, they touch upon this Subject, they treat it with the utmost Plainness and Simplicity.

3. But the last and most convincing Circumstance is the whole Form of the *Composition*. And here I shall not urge as Matter of much Weight, what has been observed by some who take this Side of the Question, the *Scenical* Image of *Job* and his Friends sitting together on the Ground seven Days and seven Nights without a Word speaking^f. Be-

^f Chap. ii. v. 13.

cause we may reasonably suppose no more to be meant than that Excess of mutual Grief making *them* unfit to give, and *him* to receive Consolation, they were so long before they entered on the Subject of their Visit.

This rather is the Matter to be admired, if we suppose it all historic Truth, that three *cordial* Friends should make a solemn Appointment to go *mourn with Job and to comfort him*^s; that they should be so greatly affected with his extreme Distresses, as to be unable to utter a Word for seven whole Days together; and yet, after this, to be no sooner set in, than entirely to forget their Errand, and, *miserable Comforters as they were*, instead of mourning with him in the Bitterness of his Soul, to wrangle with him and contradict him in every Word he spoke; and this without the least softening of Friendship; but with all the Fierceness and Acrimony of angry Disputants contending for a Victory. It was no *Trifle* neither that they insisted on, in which indeed disputatious Men are often the warmest, but a Contradiction in the very tenderest Point. They would needs have it, against all *Job's* Protestations to the contrary, that his Misfortunes came upon him in Punishment for his Crimes. Suppose their Friend had been wrong in the Judgment he passed on Things, was this a Time to animadvert in so pitiless a manner on his Errors? Would not a small Share of Affection, Pity, or even common Humanity, have disposed them to bear one seven Days longer with their old distressed Acquaintance? Human Nature is ever uniform; and the greater Passions, such as those of *Friendship* and *Natural Affection*, shew themselves the same at all Times. But we shall give an Instance from these very Times, in that amiable domestic Story of *Joseph*. He had

been cruelly injured by his Brethren. Providence had at length put them into his Power; and, in just Resentment of their inhumane Usage, he was resolved to mortify and humble them: But no sooner did he find them begin to be unhappy, than his Anger subsided, his violated Affection returned, and he melted into their Bosoms with all the Tenderneſs of a Fellow-Sufferer. This was Nature: This was History. And ſhall we ſuppoſe the Feelings of true Friendſhip to be inferior to thoſe of Family Affection? *David* thought otherwiſe, where, ſpeaking of *Jonathan*, he declares their mutual Love was wonderful, ſurpaſſing that of the ſtrongeſt natural Affection, the Paſſion between the two Sexes. The ſame have always been the Friendſhips of good Men, when founded on Virtue, and ſtrengthened by a Similitude of Manners.

Hence it appears that theſe three Friends were of a ſingular Complexion; and deſervedly gave occaſion to a Proverb that ſets them in no very honourable or advantageous Light.

But ſuppoſe now the Work to be *Dramatical*, and we immediately ſee the Reason of their Behaviour. For had they not been indulged in their ſtrange captious Humour, the Author could never have produced a Piece of that Integrity of Action, which a ſcenic Representation demanded; and they might as well have held their Tongues ſeven Days longer, as not *contradiſt* when they did begin to ſpeak.

This as to what the *Drama* in general required. But had this been all we could ſay for their Conduct, we ſhould needs confeſs that the Divine Poet had here done, what mere mortal Poets ſo frequently do; tranſgreſſed Nature (in ſuch a Representation of Friendſhip) for the ſake of his Plot. But we ſhall ſhew, when we come to examine the Moral of the Poem, that Nature is exactly followed: for

that under these three *miserable Comforters*, how *true* Friends soever in the *Fable*, certain *false* Friends were intended to be shadowed out in the *Moral*.

But now the Dispute is begun and carried on with great Warmth and Vehemence on both Sides. They affirm, they object, they answer, they reply; till having exhausted their whole Stock of Arguments, and made the Matter more doubtful than they found it, while each Party, as usual, continued stiff in his own Opinion; in this Embarras, the Author has Recourse to the common Expedient of Dramatic Writers, to draw him from his Straits, Θεὸς ὁπὸ μηχανῆς. And if ever that Precept of the Masters of Composition was well followed,

Nec Deus interfit, nisi dignus Vindice nodus,

it was here. For what can we conceive more worthy the Presence of a God than to unfold the mysterious Ways of Providence? And that this Interposition was nothing more, I think, is evident from hence: The Subject, as we observe, was of the highest Importance, namely, *Whether, and why, good Men are unhappy, and the Evil prosperous?* The Disputants had much perplexed the Question by various Answers and Replies; in which both Sides had appealed to Experience; so that there wanted a superior Wisdom to moderate and determine. But, to the Surprise of all who consider this attentively, and consider it as the strict Relation of a Fact, they find God introduced to do this in a Speech which clears up no Difficulties; but makes all Hopes of deciding the Question desperate, by an Appeal to his almighty Power^h. A plain Proof

^h *Maimonides* having given a Summary of the Dispute, draws this Inference from it: *Vide & perpende, quâ ratione hoc negotium confusos reddiderit homines, & ad sententias illas de providentiâ Dei erga creaturas quas exposuimus permoverit.* Yet, when he comes to

that

that the Interposition was only a Piece of poetical Machinery. And in that Case we see the Reason why the Knot remains untied: For the sacred Writer was no wiser when he spoke *poetically* in the Person of God, than when he spoke in that of *Job* or his Friends.

On these Accounts, and many more, which will be touched upon in the Course of this Dissertation, but are here omitted to avoid Repetition, I conclude that those Critics who suppose the Book of *Job* to be of the *Dramatic Kind* do not judge amiss.

Nor does such Idea of this truly divine Composition at all invalidate the Proofs we have from Scripture of the real Existence of this holy Patriarch, or the Truth of his exemplary Story. On the contrary, it much confirms them: seeing it was the general Practice of Dramatic Writers, of the serious Kind, to chuse an illustrious Character and well known Story, in order to give the Piece its due Dignity and Efficacy. And yet, which is very surprising, the Writers on both Sides, as well those who hold the Book of *Job* to be dramatical as those who hold it to be historical, have fallen into this Paralogism, *that, if dramatical, then the Person and History of Job fictitious*. Which nothing but their Inattention to the Nature of a Dramatic Work, and to the Practice of Dramatic Writers, could have occasioned.

But this Fallacy is not of a late standing. *Maimonides*, where he speaks of those, whose Opinion he

speaks of the Solution of these Difficulties, he could find none. But not to say nothing, the Thing most dreaded by Commentators, he pretends to discover, from the Obscurity in which Things are left, the true Scope of the Book of *Job*: *Hic fuit scopus totius libri Jobi, ut scilicet constituatur hic articulus fidei, & doceatur, à rebus naturalibus discendum esse, ut non erremus, aut cogitemus scientiam ejus [Dei sc.] ita se habere ut scientiam nostram; intentionem, providentiam, & gubernationem ejus, sicut intentionem, providentiam, & gubernationem nostram.* Mor. Nev. p. 3. c. xxiii.

seems to incline to, that says the Book of *Job* is parabolical, expresses himself in this Manner: *Nôsti quosdam esse, qui dicunt Jobum nunquam fuisse, neque creatum esse; sed HISTORIAM illius nihil aliud esse quàm Parabolam*ⁱ. As by *Historia illius* he means this Book of *Job*, it is evident he supposed the Fabulosity of that concluded against the real Existence of the Patriarch. Nay so insensibly does this inveterate Fallacy insinuate itself into our Reasonings on this Subject, that the great *Grotius* himself appears not to be quite disentangled from it. Who, tho' he saw these two Things, a real *Job* and a dramatic Representation of him, so reconcilable, that he supposed both; yet will not allow the *Book of Job* to be later than *Ezekiel*, because that Prophet mentions *Job*^k. Which, to make a good Argument, must suppose *Job* to be unknown until this Book was written: consequently that his Person was fictitious; contrary to his own Supposition, that there was a real *Job* living in the Time of *Moses*^l. It is no Wonder, after this, that the Author of the *Archæologia Philosophicæ*, whose Talent was not critical Acumen, should have reasoned so grossly on the same fallacious Principle^m.

II. Our second Question is, in what Age this Book was composed.

ⁱ *Mor. Nev.* p. 3. c. xxii.

^k Chap. xiv. v. 14.

^l Vid. *Grotii Præf. in Librum Job.*

^m This Writer endeavouring to prove the high Age of *Job*, or of the *Book of Job*, for these two Things after better Reasoners he all along confounds, closes his Arguments with this: *Denique post formatam rempublicam Judaicam, secretamque à cæteris gentibus, per instituta propria & legem à Deo datam; non facile, credo, hanc sanctam gentem, ejusdem temporis & sæculi alienigenam, vel hominem Gentilem, in exemplum pietatis proposituram, aut ipsius acta & historiam in sacros eorum codices relaturam.* *Archæol. Philos.* p. 266. Ed. 8^{vo}, 1728. The Reader sees all the Force of the Argument rests on this false Supposition, that the

1. First then we say in general, it was written some Time under the *Mosaic* Dispensation. But to this it is objected, that, if written in those Times, it is very strange that not a single Word of the *Mosaic* Law, nor any distant Allusion to the Rites or Ceremonies of it, nor any historical Circumstance under it, nor any Species of Idolatry in Use during its Period should be found in itⁿ.

I apprehend the Objection rests on one or other of these Suppositions, either that the Book is not a Work of the Dramatic Kind; or that the Hero of it is fictitious. But both these Suppositions have been shewn groundless; consequently the Objection falls with them. For to observe DECORUM is one of the most essential Rules of *Dramatic* Writing. He therefore who takes a real Personage for the Subject of his Poem will be obliged to shew him in the Customs and Sentiments of his proper Age and Country; unmixed with the Manners of the Writer's later Time and Place. Nature and the Reason of the Thing so evidently demand this Con-

Book must needs be as old as its Subject. For if *Job* was of the Patriarchal Times, he was a fit Example of Piety, let his History be wrote when it would; and, if wrote by a sacred Author, worthy to be inserted into the Canon of Scripture; and likely to be so, if composed by a *Jewish* Prophet.

ⁿ *Jobus* Arabs πολυκλειτός καὶ πολυμαθής, in cujus historiâ multa occurrunt antiquæ sapientiæ vestigia, antiquior habetur *Mose*. Idque multis patet indiciis: Primo, quòd nullibi meminerit rerum à *Mose* gestarum, sive in *Ægypto*, sive in exitu, sive in deserto. — Secundo, quòd, cùm vir pius & veri numinis cultor fuerit, legi *Mosaicæ* contraiverit, in sacrificiis faciendis. — Tertio, ex ætatis & vitæ suæ mensura, in tertio, plus minus, à Diluvio sæculo collocandus esse videtur: vixit enim ultra ducentos annos. — Cùm de Idololatria loquitur, memorat primum ipsius genus Solis & Lunæ adorationem. — Neque Sabbathi neque ullius legis factitiæ meminit. — His omnibus adducor ut credam, *Mosi* *Jobum* tempore anteisse. *Archæol. Philos.* p. 265, 266.

duct, and the Neglect of it has so indecorous an Effect, that the polite *Roman* Historian thought the *Greek* Tragic Writers to blame even for mentioning the more modern Name of *Thessaly* in their Pieces of the *Trojan* War. And he gives this plain Reason for his Censure, *Nil enim ex Persona Poëtæ, sed omnia sub eorum qui illo tempore vixerunt, dixerunt* °.

But to lay no greater Stress on this Argument than it will bear; I confess ingenuously, that were there not (as the Objection supposes) the least distant Relation or Allusion to the *Jewish* Law or History throughout the whole Book, it might reasonably create some Suspicion that the Author lived before those Times. For though this Rule of *Decorum* be so essential to *Dramatic* Writing, yet, as the greatest Masters in that Art frequently betrayed their own Times and Country in these fictitious Works, we can hardly suppose a *Jewish* Writer more exact in what only concerned the critical Perfection of his Piece. But as the Rule of *Decorum* is one of the plainest and simplest Principles of Composition, we cannot suppose a good Writer ignorant of it; and so are not to look for any of those glaring Absurdities like what are to be found in the *Dramatic* Writings of late barbarous Ages; but what might easily escape the most critical and attentive Writer.

Some slight *Indecorums* therefore we may reasonably expect to find, if the Author were indeed a *Jew*: and such, if I am not much mistaken, we do find. *Job* speaking of the wicked Man, says: *He that speaketh Flattery to his Friends, even the Eyes of his Children shall fail* ^p. — *God layeth up Iniquity*

° *Vell. Pater. Hist. l. i. c. 3.* ^p *Chap. xvii. v. 5.*

for his Children^q. Again he says: *That Idolatry was an Iniquity to be punished by the Judge*^r. Now both these Species of Punishment were, as we have shewn, peculiar to the *Mosaic Dispensation*. But a *Jew* might naturally not reflect that they could not be Part of the general Law of God and Nature. And so, while he was really describing the Oeconomy under which he lived, suppose himself to be representing the Customs and Notions of more ancient Times: Which that it was his Design to do, in the last Instance at least, appears from his mentioning only the most early Species of Idolatry, the Worship of the *Sun* and *Moon*^s.

But there is, besides this of *Customs* and *Notions*, another Circumstance that will always betray a feigned Composition, made in an Age remote from the Subject: And that is the Use of later *Phrases*. These are easily discoverable in the modern or learned Languages: But more difficultly in the very ancient ones; especially in the *Hebrew*, of which there is only one, and that no very large Volume, remaining. And yet even here we detect an Author of a later Age. For besides the *Phrases* of ordinary Original, there are some in every Language interwoven, like the other, into the current Style, which owe their Rise to some very singular Circumstances of Time and Place; and so may be easily traced up to their Birth: though, being long used in common Speech in a general Signification, they may well escape even an attentive Writer. Thus *Zophar*, speaking of the wicked Man, says: *He shall not see the Rivers, the Floods, the Brooks of HONEY AND BUTTER*^t. This, in common Speech, only signified *Plenty* in the Abstract; but seems to have

^q Chap. xxi. v 19.

^r Chap. xxxi. v 28.

^s v 26.

^t Chap. xx. v 17.

been a proverbial Speech taken from the Descriptions of the holy Land^v. Again, *Eliphaz* says, *Receive, I pray thee, THE LAW FROM HIS MOUTH, and lay up his Words in thine Heart*^u. That is, *be obedient*: But the Phrase was taken from the verbal Delivery of the *Jewish* Law from the Mount *Sinai*. The Rabbins were so sensible of the expressive Peculiarity of this Phrase, that they say the Law of *Moses* is here spoken of by a kind of prophetic Anticipation. And again, *Job* cries out: *Oh that I were — as I was in the Days of my Youth, when the SECRET OF GOD WAS UPON MY TABERNACLE*^w, that is, *in full Security*. Evidently taken from the Residence of the divine Presence or *Shekinah*, in a visible Form, on the *Ark*, or on the *Tent* where the *Ark* was placed.

Hitherto the Author seems *unwarily* to have betrayed his Times and Country. But we shall now see that he has made numerous Allusions to the miraculous History of his Ancestors with *set Purpose and Design*. For this Poem being written, as will appear, for the Comfort and Solace of his Countrymen, he reasonably supposed it would advance his Purpose, to refresh their Memories with some of the most signal Adventures of their Forefathers. In the mean time, *Decorum*, of which we find him a careful Observer, required him to preserve the Image of very different and distant Times. This was a Difficulty: and would be so to the most able Writer. They were both Matters of Importance, and neither the one nor the other could be omitted without neglecting his End, or deforming his Composition. How then can we conceive a skilful Ar-

^v See EXOD. iii. 8. — xiii. 5. — xxxiii. 3, 4. — DEUT. xxxi. 20. — 2 KINGS xviii. 32.

^u Chap. xxii. § 22. ^w Chap. xxix. § 4.

tist would act but thus; draw those Allusions, but so lightly touched, and so deeply shaded as to remain unobserved by an inattentive Reader; yet be visible enough to such as studied the Work with Care and Exactness. Now this artful Temper our divine Writer, we say, has preserved. The Conduct was fine and noble: and the Shade, in which he was forced to leave his Allusions, will be so far from bringing the *Reality* of them into Question, that it will confirm that Reality; it now appearing that if an able Writer would, in such a Work, make Allusions to his own Times, Religion, and People, it must be done in the most covert Manner. Thus *Job*, speaking of the Omnipotence of God, *Which commandeth the Sun, and it riseth not, and sealeth up the Stars*^x, alludes to the miraculous History of the People of God, such as the *Egyptian* Darkness, and the stopping the Sun's Course by *Joshua*. This appeared so certain to a learned Commentator, in the other Opinion of this Book's being of *Job*'s own Writing, that he was reduced to the Supposition of his Author's speaking proleptically, as knowing what God in a future Age would do^y. So where *Job* says, *He divideth the Sea with his Power, and by his Understanding he smiteth through the Proud*^z, the Destruction of *Pharaoh* and his Host in the Red-sea is plainly referred to. Again, Who can doubt but that the following Words, *He taketh away the Heart of the Chief of the People of the Earth, and causeth them to wander in a Wilderness where there is no Way*^a, allude to

^x Chap. ix. v. 7. ^y Hoc videtur respicere historiam Josuæ vel Ezechiae, quanquam ante illa *Job* extiterit. Sed hæc potuerunt per anticipationem dici, quod *Jobum* non lateret penes Deum esse id efficere quandocunque luberet. *Codurcus in locum.*

^z Chap. xxvi. v. 12.

^a Chap. xii. v. 24.

the wandering of the *Israelites* forty Years in the Wilderness in Punishment for their Cowardice and Diffidence in God's Promises? *Eliphaz*, speaking of the wonderful Works of God, declares how he came to the Knowledge of them, *I will shew thee, bear me; and what I have seen I will declare; which wise Men have told from their Fathers, and have not hid it*^b. The very Way *Moses* directs the *Israelites* to preserve the Memory of the miraculous Works of God. And who are these *wise Men*? They are so particularly marked out as not to be mistaken: *Unto whom alone the Earth was given, and no Stranger passed amongst them*^c. A Circumstance agreeing to no People whatsoever but the *Israelites* settled in *Canaan*. The same *Eliphaz* telling *Job* to his Face that his Misfortunes came in Punishment for his Crimes, says: *Thou hast taken a Pledge from thy Brother for nought, and stripped the Naked of his Cloathing*^d. And *Job*, speaking of the most profligate of Men, describes them, amongst other Marks, by this, that *they caused the Naked to lodge without Cloathing, that they have no Covering in the cold*^e; that *they take a Pledge of the Poor, and cause him to go naked without Cloathing*^f. Who that sees this ranked amongst the greatest Enormities, but will reflect that it must have been wrote by one studied in the Law of *Moses*, which says: *If thou at all take thy Neighbour's Raiment to pledge, thou shalt deliver it unto him by that the Sun goeth down; for that is his Covering only, it is his Raiment for his Skin: Wherein shall he sleep? And it shall come to pass when he crieth unto me, that I will hear, for I am gracious.* *Elibu*, speaking of

^b Chap. xv. v. 17, 18.^c v. 19.^d Chap. xxii. v. 6.^e Chap. xxiv. v. 7.^f v. 9, 10.^g EXOD. xxii. 26, 27.

See also DEUT. xxiv. 12 and 17.

GOD's Dealing with his Servants, says: "That he
 " may *withdraw Man from his Purpose*, and hide
 " *Pride* from Man, he keepeth back his Soul from
 " *the Pit*, and his Life from *perishing by the Sword*.
 " He is chastened also with Pain upon his *Bed*, and
 " the Multitude of his Bones with strong Pain. His
 " Soul draweth *nigh unto the Grave*, and his Life
 " to the Destroyers. If there be a *Messenger* with
 " him, an *Interpreter*, one amongst a thousand to shew
 " unto Man his *Uprightness*, then he is gracious un-
 " to him, and saith, *Deliver him from going down*
 " *to the Pit*, I have found a Ransom. His *Flesh*
 " shall be fresher than a Child's, he shall return to the
 " *Days of his Youth*. He shall pray unto God, and
 " he will be favourable unto him, and he shall see
 " *his Face with Joy*; for he will render unto Man
 " his Righteousness^h." This is the most circum-
 stantial Account of GOD's Dealing with *Hezekiah*,
 as it is told in the Books of *Chronicles* and *Kings*.
 GOD had delivered him from *perishing by the Sword*
 of *Sennacherib*: "In those Days *Hezekiah* was
 " sick to the Death, and prayed unto the LORD:
 " and he spake unto him, and he gave him a Sign.
 " But *Hezekiah* rendered not again, according to
 " the Benefit done unto him, for *his Heart was*
 " *lifted up*ⁱ." But the Story is told more at large
 in the Book of *Kings*: — "In those Days was *He-*
 " *zekiah sick unto Death*: and the *Prophet Isaiah*,
 " the Son of *Amoz* came to him, and said unto him,
 " Thus saith the LORD, Set thine House in order,
 " for thou shalt die and not live. Then he turned
 " his Face to the Wall, and *prayed unto the Lord*.
 " — And it came to pass, afore *Isaiah* was gone out
 " into the middle Court, that the Word of the LORD

^h Chap. xxiii. v. 17, & seq.ⁱ 2 CHRON. xxxii. 24, 25.

" came

“ came unto him, *saying, Turn again, and tell He-*
 “ *zekiah, Thus saith the LORD, I have heard thy*
 “ *Prayer, I have seen thy Tears: Behold I will heal*
 “ *thee; on the third Day thou shalt go up unto the*
 “ *House of the Lord. And Isaiah said, Take a Lump*
 “ *of Figs; and they took and laid it on the Boil,*
 “ *and he recovered^k.*” The following Words as
 plainly refer to the Destruction of the First-born in
Egypt, and *Sennacherib's Army ravaging Judea: In*
a Moment shall they die, and the People shall be trou-
bled at Midnight and pass away, and the Mighty shall
be taken away without Hand^l: As these do to the
Egyptian Darkness, From the Wicked their Light is
withholden^m. Nor can there be a more exact De-
 scription of God's Discipline of the *Jews*, to whom
 from Time to Time he sent Prophets to warn them
 of their wicked Ways, and of the impending De-
 struction that attended them, than in the following
 Words of *Elihu: Then he sheweth them their Work*
and their Transgressions that they have exceeded. He
openeth also their Ear to Discipline, and commandeth
that they return from Iniquity. If they obey and serve
him, they shall spend their Days in Prosperity, and
their Years in Pleasures. But if they obey not, they
shall perish by the Sword, and they shall die without
Knowledgeⁿ.

In the Management of these Allusions, we see,
 the Author has observed a strict *Decorum*: and, to
 take off all their offensive Glare, has thrown over
 them a sober Image of ancient Manners. So that
 here we have the plain Marks of former Times in-
 termixed with Circumstances peculiar to the latter.
 What are we therefore to conclude from this but

^k 2 KINGS xx. 1, & seq.

^l Chap. xxxiv. v 20.

^m Chap. xxxviii. v 15.

ⁿ Chap. xxxvi. v 9, & seq.

that the Work is a Species of Dramatic Writing composed long after the Age of the Subject?

On the whole then it appears that this Objection, which, if well grounded, had made nothing against the low Date of a poetic Composition, is not indeed supported by real Fact, as will be more fully seen hereafter.

After such clear Evidence of the Book of *Job*'s being written under the Law, we have little need of *Grotius*'s Argument, from its containing many similar Passages to the Book of *Psalms*. And it is well we have not, because I think his Argument very equivocal. For if the sacred Writers must needs have borrowed trite moral Sentences from one another; it may be as fairly said, that the Authors of the *Psalms* borrowed from the Book of *Job*; as that the Author of *Job* borrowed from the Book of *Psalms*. But Mr. *Le Clerc* would mend this Argument, by refining upon it, a way that seldom mends any thing. He says one may know an Original from a Copy by the latter's having less Force and Nature; and he thinks he sees this in the Book of *Job*°. Now admitting the Truth of his Observation, it would be so far from supporting, that it would overturn his Conclusion. Mr. *Le Clerc* seems

° — *Grotius* croit avec beaucoup plus de vrai-semblance, que cet auteur est postérieur à David & à Salomon, dont il semble qu'il ait imité divers endroits, & remarque fort judicieusement qu'il y a dans ce livre des manières de parler, qu'on ne trouve que dans *Esdra*s, dans *Daniel*, & dans les Paraphrases *Caldaiques*. *Codurc*, dans son Commentaire sur *Job*, a aussi remarqué plusieurs *Caldaismes* dans ce livre, & quelques personnes savantes soutiennent, que les *Arabismes* qu'on y croit avoir remarqué ne sont que des manières de parler *Caldéenes*. On y trouve des imitations de divers endroits des *Pseaumes*. — Mais vous me demanderez peut-être, comment on peut savoir, que c'est l'auteur du livre de *Job*, qui a imité ces *Pseaumes*, & non pas les auteurs de ces *Pseaumes*, qui ont imité le livre de *Job*? Il est aisé de vous

to have been misled into this Criticism by what he had observed of Writers of *less* polished Ages borrowing from those of *more*. In this Case, the Copy will be always much inferior to the Original. But the Effect would have been just otherwise in a Writer of the Time of *David* borrowing from one of the Time of *Moses*. And as the common Opinion places these Books in those two distant Periods, they are to be supposed rightly placed, till the contrary be proved. This Observation we see verified in the *Greek* Authors of the *Socratic* Age, and the *Roman* Authors of the *Augustan*, when they borrowed from their very early Country Writers. But the Matter of Fact is, I think, just otherwise. The Advantage of the Sublime, in the parallel Passages, seems to lie on the side of *Job*. And from hence we may draw Mr. *Le Clerc's* Conclusion with much more Probability. But indeed take it any way, the Argument, as I said, is of little Weight.

2. We now come closer to the Question; and having proved it to be written under the *Mosaic* *Oeconomy*, we say, it must be *somewhere between the Time of their approaching Captivity, and their thorough Re-establishment in Judea*. This is the largest Period we can give it. Our Reason seems to be decisive. It is this, that no other possible Period can be assigned for the grand Question, handled in this Book, ever coming into Dispute. This deserves to be considered.

The Question, a very foreign one to us, and therefore no Wonder it should have been so little attended to, is, *Whether God administers his Government*

satisfaire. On connoit qu'un auteur en imite un autre à ceci, c'est que l'imitation n'est pas si belle que l'original, qui exprime ordinairement les choses d'une manière plus nette & plus naturelle que la copie. Sentimens de quelques Theol. de Hol. p. 183.

over Men here with an equal Providence, so as that the Good are always prosperous, and the Bad unhappy; or whether, on the contrary, there be not such apparent Inequality, as that Prosperity and Adversity often happen indifferently to Good and Bad. Job maintains the latter Part of the Question, and his three Friends the former. They argue these Points throughout the whole Dispute, and each Party sticks firm to his first Opinion.

Now this could never have been made *Matter of Dispute*, from the most early supposed Time of Job's Existence, even to ours, in any Place out of the Land of *Judea*; the Administration of Providence, which, throughout this Period, all Ages and Countries have experienced, being visibly and confessedly *unequal*. Men, indeed, at all Times, have been indiscreetly prone to enquire how this Inequality could be made consistent with God's Justice and Goodness: But, in all the vast Variety of human Opinions, as extravagant as many of those are which philosophic Men have some time or other held, we do not find any of them ever conceived or maintained that *God's Providence was equally administered*. This therefore, as we say, could be no Question any where out of the Land of *Judea*. But we say farther,

Nor *there* neither, in any Period of the *Jewish* Nation either before or after that in which we place it. Not *before*, because the Dispensation of Providence to this People was seen and owned by all to be equal: Not *after*, because by the total ceasing of God's extraordinary Administration the contrary was as evident.

Of this Period then, there are three Portions:
 1. The *Time* immediately *preceding* the Captivity;
 2. The *Duration* of it; and 3. The *Return* from it.
 To the Opinions which place it in either of the two
 first

first Portions, as supposing it to be written for the Consolation of the People going into, or remaining in Captivity, a great Writer has opposed an unanswerable Objection: “The *Jews* (says he) undoubtedly suffered for their Iniquity; and the Example of *Job* is the Example of an innocent Man suffering for no Demerit of his own: Apply this to the *Jews* in their Captivity, and the Book contradicts all the Prophets before, and at the Time of their Captivity, and is calculated to harden the *Jews* in their Sufferings, and to reproach the Providence of God P.”

There remains only the third Portion, that is to say, their Return, and Settlement in their own Land. And this stands clear of the great Writer’s Objections. For the *Jews* came from the Captivity with Hearts full of Zeal for the Law, and Abhorrence of all their former Idolatries. This is the Account *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*^q give of them: And with these Dispositions, *Jeremiah* predicted their Restoration: *I will bring Israel again to his Habitation, and he shall feed on Carmel and Bashan,*

^p *The Use and Intent of Prophecy, &c.* p. 208. 3^d Ed. — *Grotius* thinks the Book was written for the Consolation of the Descendants of *Esau*, carried away in the *Babylonish* Captivity; apparently, as the same great Writer observes, to avoid the Absurdity arising from the Supposition confuted above; and yet, as he farther observes, *Grotius*, in endeavouring to avoid one Difficulty, has fallen into another. For, *suppose it writ* (says this excellent Author) *for the Children of Esau, they were Idolaters; and yet is there no Allusion to their Idolatry in all this Book. And what Ground is there to think they were so righteous, as to deserve such an Interpretation to be put upon their Sufferings, as the Book of Job puts on them, if so be it was written for their Sakes? Or can it be imagined, that a Book writ about the Time supposed, for the Use of an idolatrous Nation, and odious to the Jews, could ever have been received into the Jewish Canon?* p. 208. These are unfurmountable Objections, and will oblige us to place this Opinion amongst the Singularities of the excellent *Grotius*.

^q *EZRA*, Chapters iii, vi. *NEH.* Chapters, iii, viii, ix.

and

and his Soul shall be satisfied upon Mount Ephraim and Gilead. In those Days, and in that Time, saith the Lord, the Iniquity of Israel shall be sought for, and there shall be none; and the Sins of Judah, and they shall not be found^r.

3. We say then (to come home to the Question) that the Book of *Job* was written some Time between the Return and thorough Settlement of the *Jews* in their own Country. Having suited the Time, let us see if we can suit the Subject; and whether *this*, which was foreign and unnatural to every other Period, was proper and seasonable to that here assigned.

The *Jews* had hitherto, from their Entrance into the Land of *Canaan*, to their last Race of Kings, lived under an extraordinary, and, for the most part, equal Providence. As the Time of the Captivity approached, they had a Series of Prophets to comfort and support them with the Promises of a speedy Return; to be attended with more illustrious Advantages for the *Jewish* Republic than it had ever yet experienced. The appointed Time was now come. And their Return (predicted in so plain and public a Manner) was brought about with as uncommon Circumstances. Those most zealous for the Law, and most confiding in the Promises of God, as instructed by their Parents in all his extraordinary Dispensations, embraced this Opportunity of visiting again their own Country to promote the Restoration of their Law and Religion. Who then can doubt but that these Men expected the same Manifestations of God's Providence in their Re-establishment, that their Forefathers had found in their first Settlement? That they were indeed full of these Expectations appears from the remarkable

^r Chap. 1. v 19, 20.

Account *Ezra* gives us of his Distress, when about to return, with *Artaxerxes's* Commission, to regulate the Affairs of *Judea* and *Jerusalem*. The Way was long and dangerous; yet the *Jews* had told the King so much of their being under the peculiar Care of their God, that he was ashamed to ask a Guard for himself and his Companions; and therefore had Recourse to Prayer and Fasting: *Then I proclaimed a Fast there at the River Ahava, that we might afflict ourselves before our God, to seek of him a right Way for us, and for our little ones, and for all our Substance. For I was ashamed to require of the King a Band of Soldiers and Horsemen, to help us against the Enemy in the Way; because we had spoken unto the King, saying, The Hand of our God is upon all them for good that seek him, but his Power and his Wrath is against all them that forsake him^s.* But in these their Expectations of the old extraordinary Providence, they were greatly deceived; and the long Traverses they underwent from the Malice and Persecution of their idolatrous Neighbours, made them but too sensible of the Difference of their Condition from that of their Forefathers, in their first Establishment. How great then must be their Surprize and Disappointment to find all their Hopes vanish, and their Nation about to be reduced under the common Care of Heaven, with the rest of Mankind? At first it would be difficult for many habituated to, and long possessed of the Notion of, an equal Providence to credit the true State of their present Circumstances. Others would fall into Doubts about God's Justice; as not conceiving how he could discharge the Expectations he had raised without some very particular Regard to their Safety. All would be in a State of Anxiety and

^s EZRA viii. 21, 22.

Disorder: and this greatly increased, 1. From the bad Situation of Affairs *without*. For, till the coming of *Nehemiah*, the Walls of *Jerusalem* were in many Places broken down; the Gates gone; and the Inhabitants exposed to the Insults and Ravages of their Enemies; and to the Reproach and Contempt of all their Neighbours; as a despicable and abandoned People. 2. From the bad Situation of Affairs *within*. Several Disorders, contrary to the Law, had crept in amongst them; as the *marrying strange Wives*, and *exercising Usury*. Add to all this, what would infinitely increase the Confusion, that a future State of Rewards and Punishments was not yet become a popular Doctrine amongst them. That this is a faithful Account of their Condition will be seen when we descend to particulars: That it would have this Effect on the religious Sentiments even of the better Sort is evident from the Expostulation of *Jeremiah*, in whose Time this *Inequality* first struck their Observation: *Righteous art thou, O Lord* (says he) *when I plead with thee: yet let me talk with thee of thy Judgments. Wherefore doth the Way of the Wicked prosper? Wherefore are all they happy that deal very treacherously?*

Could any thing therefore be conceived more seasonable and necessary, at this Time, than such a Work as the Book of *Job*? In which, on a traditional Story of great Fame and Reputation all over the East, a good Man was represented as afflicted for the Trial of his Virtue; and rewarded for his Afflictions: and in which, their Doubts about God's Providence were piously resolved into his Almighty Power. For to quiet all their Anxieties, and to comfort them under their present Distresses was, I suppose, the Reason of one of their Pro-

phets composing the Book of *Job* at this very Period.

But if such was the End of writing this poetic Story, we cannot but suppose every Thing in it would be fitted to the Circumstances of those Times. But this could not be done without making the Poem ALLEGORICAL as well as *Dramatic*. That is, representing the real Persons of that Age under the Persons of the *Drama*. And this according to the exactest Rules of good Writing. For when some *general Moral*, fit for all Times, is to be recommended, it is best shewn in a simple Dramatic Image: But when the Author's Purpose is to convey some *peculiar circumstantial Truths*, they have need to be enforced in *allegorical* Representations. And in Fact, we shall find this Poem to be wholly *Allegorical*. The Reason is convincing. There are divers Circumstances added to each Character, which can, by no Means, belong to the Persons *representing*: we conclude, therefore, that others are meant under those Characters, as the Persons *represented*. Nor did the Author seem much solicitous to conceal his Purpose, while, in his Introduction to some of *Job's* Speeches, he expresses himself thus, *Moreover Job continued his PARABLE and said*^v. Which Word *Parable* properly signifies, in Scripture, the representing one Thing by another. And in this Sense we shall find the Speeches of *Job* to be extremely *parabolical*. But to leave no room for Doubt in this Matter, let us now examine each Character apart.

I. In the Person of *JOB* we have a good Man afflicted, and maintaining his Innocence; equally impatient of Pain and Contradiction; yet, at last, submitting to the Will of *GOD*, and finally

^v Chap. xxvii. § 1. Chap. xxix. § 1.

rewarded. Had this been a fictitious Character, we could have only gathered this general Moral from it, that Virtue and Submission to the divine Pleasure, notwithstanding the common Frailties of Humanity, will certainly engage the Care of Providence. But as this Hero of the Poem was a real Person; and so famed all over the East for his exemplary *Patience* in Afflictions that it became proverbial^w, we can never account for his Behaviour when we find him breaking out, ever and anon, into such Excesses of Impatience as border even upon Blasphemy. We conclude therefore, that, from this Book, the Fame of so great *Patience* could never have arisen. The judicious *Calmet* cannot forbear saying on this Occasion, “ En effet Job avoit marqué dans ses plaintes
 “ une vivacité que pouvoit être interprétée en mau-
 “ vaise part. Il s’etoit plaint de la rigueur de Dieu;
 “ il avoit déploré son malheur d’une manière qui
 “ avoit besoin d’une interpretation bénigne^x.” And to the same Purpose *Albertus Schultens*, “ In eo ex-
 “ cessu ut ne nunc quidem Jobum culpa liberare
 “ possumus, ita facile intelligitur, multo magis ta-
 “ libus dictis offendi tunc debuisse Elihuum, igna-
 “ rum hactenus, quid Deus de Jobo ejusque causa
 “ pronunciaturus esset^y.” Thus softly do these Commentators speak, in their Embarras to reconcile this Representation of *Job* to the traditional Character of his *Patience*. The *Writing* then and the *Tradition* being so intirely inconsistent, we must needs conclude some other Character to be shadowed under that of *Job*.

And this, I say, was no other than the *Jewish People*. The great Point *Job* insists upon, throughout the whole Book, is his *Innocence*: and yet, to

^w Ye have heard of the Patience of Job, JAM. v. 11.

^x Sur Chap. xxxiii. § 10.

^y On the same Place.

our Surprise, we hear him, in one Place, thus expostulating with God: *Thou writest bitter Things against me, and makest me to possess the INIQUITIES OF MY YOUTH*^z. This can be accounted for no otherwise than by understanding it of the *People*: Whose repeated Iniquities, on their first coming out of *Egypt*, were in every Age remembered, and punished on their Posterity. Again, the *twenty ninth Chapter* is an exact and circumstantial Description of the prosperous Times of the *Jewish People*; several Parts of which can be understood with no tolerable Propriety of the Condition of a private Man:—“O that I were as in the Days when God
 “ preserved me, when his Candle shined upon my
 “ Head, and when, by his Light, I walked through
 “ Darknes: As I was in the Days of my Youth,
 “ when the Secret of God was upon my Taber-
 “ nacle: — When I washed my Steps with Butter,
 “ and the Rock poured me out Rivers of Oil. — I
 “ put on Righteousness and it clothed me: My
 “ Judgment was as a Robe and a Diadem. — I brake
 “ the Jaws of the Wicked, and pluckt the Spoil out
 “ of his Teeth. — I chose out their Way, and sat
 “ Chief, and dwelt as a King in the Army^a.” In these Words the Writer evidently alludes to the *Pillar of Fire* in the Wilderness; — The *Schekinah* in the Tabernacle; — The *Land flowing with Milk and Honey*; — The Administration of the *Judges*; — The curbing the Ravages of the *Philistines*; — And the Glory of their first Monarchs. Well therefore might the Writer, in his Introduction to this Speech, call it a *Parable*. And again, when *Eliku*, who, as we shall see, was in the Prophet’s Stead, comes to answer *Job*, he says, *I will answer thee, and thy*

^z Chap. xiii. v 26.^a v 2, & seq.

Companions with thee^b, implying that there was a Number in the same Complaint.

This leads us next to consider the *Age*, as well as *People* meant. *Job*, speaking of his Misfortunes, says: *For the Thing which I greatly feared is come upon me, and that which I was afraid of is come unto me. I was not in Safety, neither had I Rest, neither was I quiet, yet Trouble came*^c. But in other Places he speaks very differently. He wishes *he were as in Months past, for then* (says he) *I shall die in my Nest, and I shall multiply my Days as the Sand*^d. And again, *When I looked for Good, then Evil came upon me; and when I waited for Light, there came Darknes*^e. These Things are entirely discordant, if understood of one and the same Person; and can never be reconciled but on the Supposition of an *allegorical* Reference to another Character; and then all is right. For this *Disquiet*, and *Fear* of approaching *Trouble*, was the very Condition of the *Jews* on their first Return from the Captivity. Thus *Ezra* expresses it: *And they set up the Altar upon his Bases* (for *Fear* was upon them, because of the People of those Countries) *and they offered Burnt-Offerings thereon unto the Lord*^f. And thus *Zechariah*, who prophesied at this Time: *For before these Days there was no Hire for Man, nor any Hire for Beast, neither was there any Peace to him that went out or came in, because of the Affliction; for I set all Men every one against his Neighbour*^g. — *Job*, amongst his other Distresses, reckons this: *Thou scarest me with Dreams, and terrifiest me with Visions*^h. Which, I suppose, refers to the Comminations of *Haggai*, *Zechariah*, and *Malachi*, who all prophesied, and were very troublesome, on that Account, to the impatient *Jews*. —

^b Chap. xxxv. v. 4.

^d Chap. xxix. v. 18.

^g ZECH. viii. 10.

^c Chap. iii. v. 25, 26.

^e Chap. xxx. v. 26.

^h Chap. vii. v. 14.

^f EZRA iii. 3.

To whose Circumstances only and Spirit of Complaint, these obscure Words of *Job*, expostulating with GOD, can agree: *And why dost thou not pardon my Transgression, and take away mine Iniquity? For now I shall sleep in the Dust, and thou shalt seek me in the Morning, but I shall not be*ⁱ. As much as to say, in thus punishing, thou wilt defeat thy own Design. It is thy Purpose to continue us a peculiar People; yet such Traverses as we have met with, on our Return, will soon destroy the *Jews* already come into *Judea*, and deter the rest from running the same Fortune. This is an easy, and appears the true Exposition of this very difficult Passage. — *Job* goes on in the same Strain: *Is it good unto thee that thou shouldest oppress? that thou shouldest despise the Work of thine Hands? and shine upon the Counsel of the Wicked*^k? The very Complaint made by the *Jews* of this Time. *I have loved you, saith the Lord, yet ye say, Wherein hast thou loved us*^l? And again, *And now we call the Proud happy; yea they that work Wickedness are set up; yea they that tempt God are even delivered*^m. — But *Job* goes on, and says: *O that thou wouldest hide me in the Grave, that thou wouldest keep me secret, until thy Wrath be past, that thou wouldest appoint me a set Time and remember me*ⁿ. The excellent Writer mentioned before, on the common Supposition that these Words are to be understood only of *Job*'s Person, shews unanswerably, that he had some Expectations of a future State? — “What Time was it, do you imagine, that *Job* desired to be appointed for him? “Was it the Time of this Life? If so, how could “it succeed his *being hid in the Grave*? No, he “had other Hopes, and expected to be called from

ⁱ Chap. vii. v. 21.^k Chap. x. v. 3.^l MALAC. i. 2.^m MALAC. iii. 15.ⁿ Chap. xiv. v. 13.

“the Grave, and seems assured that God would not desert his Creatures even there^o.” But the Words thus interpreted, directly contradict many other Declarations of *Job*, particularly one just before, *For now I shall sleep in the Dust, and thou shalt seek me in the Morning, but I shall not be*: The most express Declaration to the contrary: Therefore I make no Question but by the Words, *O that thou wouldest hide me in the Grave, &c.* the Complaints of the *Jews* of that Time are again referred to; which were, as appears from the Words of *Job*, to this Effect: Would to God we had still continued in the Captivity [the *Grave*, the very Figure used by the Prophets for the Captivity] expecting a more favourable Season for our Restoration; or that we might be permitted to return to it, ’till the Remains of Punishment for our Forefathers Sins were past, and all Things fitly prepared for our Reception. And in these cowardly and impatient Sentiments were they on their Return, as well as their Ancestors, on their first coming out of the Land of *Egypt*; to which, this Return is frequently compared by the Prophets. — *Job* goes on expressing his Condition in this Manner: *His Troops come together, and raise up their Way against me, and encamp round about my Tabernacle. He hath put my Brethren far from me, and mine Acquaintance are verily estranged from me. My Kinsfolk have failed, and my familiar Friends have forgotten me^p.* The first Part of this Complaint relates to the *Arabians*, the *Ammonites*, and the *Ashdodites*; who (as *Nehemiah* tells us) bearing that the Walls of Jerusalem were made up, and that the Breaches began to be stopped, were very wroth, and conspired all of them together, to come and

^o *Use and Intent of Prophecy*, p. 240. ^p Chap. xix.
^y 12, 13, 14.

fight against Jerusalem and to hinder it^q. The second Part relates to their rich Brethren remaining in *Babylon*, who seemed, by *Nehemiah's* Account, to have much neglected the distressed Remnant that escaped from the Captivity to *Jerusalem*. Then *Hanani* (says he) *one of my Brethren came, he and certain Men of Judah, and I asked them concerning the Jews that had escaped, which were left of the Captivity, and concerning Jerusalem. And they said unto me, The Remnant that are left of the Captivity there in the Province are in great Affliction and Reproach: The Wall of Jerusalem also is broken down, and the Gates thereof are burnt with Fire*^r. — *Job* goes on, *O that I knew where I might find him [God] that I might come even to his Seat. Behold I go forward, but he is not there, and backward but I cannot perceive him: On the left Hand where he doth work, but I cannot behold him: He hideth himself on the right Hand that I cannot see him*^s. Could any Thing more pathetically express the Laments of a People who saw the extraordinary Providence departing from them? — From God, *Job* turns to Man, and says, “ But now they that are younger than I have
 “ me in Derision, whose Fathers I would have dis-
 “ dained to have set with the Dogs of my Flock.
 “ Yea, whereto might the Strength of their Hands
 “ profit me, in whom old Age was perished? For
 “ Want and Famine they were solitary: fleeing in-
 “ to the Wilderness in former Time desolate and
 “ waste: Who cut up Mallows by the Bushes, and
 “ Juniper-Roots for their Meat. They were driven
 “ forth from among Men (they cried after them
 “ as after a Thief) to dwell in the Clifts of the
 “ Valleys, in the Caves of the Earth, and in the

^q NEHEM. iv. 7, 8.^r NEHEM. i. 2, 3.^s Chap. xxiii. v 3, 8, 9.

“ Rocks.

“ Rocks. Amongst the Bushes they brayed, under
 “ the Nettles they were gathered together. They
 “ were Children of *Fools*, yea Children of base
 “ Men: they were viler than the Earth^t.” This
 is a Description, and a very exact one, of the *Cu-
 theans* or *Samaritans*; of their Behaviour to the
Jews; and the Sentiments of the *Jews* concerning
 them. These *had him in Derision*, he says, and so
Nehemiah informs us: “ But it came to pass, that
 “ when *Sanballat* heard that we builded the Wall,
 “ he was wroth, and took great Indignation, and
 “ mocked the *Jews*. And he spake before his Bre-
 “ thren and the Army of *Samaria*, and said: What
 “ do these feeble *Jews*? Will they fortify them-
 “ selves? Will they sacrifice? Will they make an
 “ End in a Day? Will they revive the Stones out
 “ of the Heaps of the Rubbish, which are burnt?
 “ Now *Tobiab* the *Ammonite* was by him, and he said,
 “ Even that which they build, if a Fox go up, he shall
 “ even break down their Stone Wall. Hear, O our
 “ God, for we are despised, and turn their *Reproach*
 “ upon their own Head^v.” &c. And God, by the
 Prophet *Malachi*, tells the *Jews* the Reason why he
 suffered them to be thus humbled: *Therefore have I*
*also made you contemptible and base before all the Peo-
 ple, according as ye have not kept my Ways, but have*
been partial in the Law^w. — *Job* says he would
 have disdained to have set these with the Dogs of his
 Flock, that they were younger than him, that they
 were Children of Fools, yea of base Men, viler than
 the Earth. It is well known in what sovereign Ha-
 tred and Contempt the *Jews* held the *Cutheans* or
Samaritans above all People. The Character here
 given of the Baseness of their Extraction, without

^t Chap. xxx. v 1, & seq.^v NEH. iv. 1, & seq.^w MAL. ii. 9.

Doubt, was very just. For when a Conqueror, as here the King of *Assyria*, would repeople, with his own Subjects, a strange Country entirely ravaged and burnt up by an extirpating War, none but the very Scum of a People would be sent upon such a Settlement. And by the Account *Ezra* gives us of this Colony, as collected out of many distant Parts of the *Assyrian* Empire, we may fairly conclude them to be the Off-scourings of the East. “Then wrote
 “*Rehum* the Chancellor, and *Shimsbai* the Scribe,
 “and the rest of their Companions, the *Dinaites*,
 “the *Apharsathchites*, the *Tarpelites*, the *Apharsites*,
 “the *Archevites*, the *Babylonians*, the *Susanchites*,
 “the *Dehavites*, and the *Elamites*, and the rest of
 “the Nations whom the great and noble *Asnapper*
 “brought over and set in the Cities of *Samaria*^x.”
Job describes them as being at first reduced to the utmost Distresses for Food and Harbour, in a desolate and waste Wilderness, living upon Roots, and dwelling in Caves and Clifts of the Rock. And assuredly such must have been the first Entertainment of this wretched Colony, transplanted into a Country quite wasted and destroyed by a three Years incessant Ravage^y; nay before they could come up to take Possession of their Desolation, the wild Beasts were got before them, and a Scourge of Lions ready prepared to receive them for their idolatrous Pollutions of the Holy Land^z. — *Job* has now ended his Parable, and God is brought in to judge the Disputants; whose Speech opens in this Manner: Then the Lord answered Job out of the Whirlwind and said, Who is this that darkeneth Counsel by Words without Knowledge^a? The very Character the Prophets give of the People of this Time. Ye have

^x EZRA iv. 9, 10. ^y 2 KINGS xvii. 5. ^z 2 KINGS xvii. 25. ^a Chap. xxxviii. *y* 1, 2.

wearied the Lord with your Words^b, says Malachi. And again: *Your Words have been stout against me, saith the Lord^c.*—But on Job's repeated Submission and Humiliation, God declares his Acceptance of him. And thus he received the People into Grace, as we learn by the Prophet Zechariah: *Thus saith the Lord, I am returned unto Zion, and will dwell in the Midst of Jerusalem^d.*—Also the Lord gave Job TWICE as much as he had before^e. And in the same Manner God speaks to the People by the Prophet: *Turn ye to the Strong-hold, ye Prisoners of Hope, even to day do I declare that I will render DOUBLE unto thee^f.*—Job's Brethren now came to comfort him, and every Man gave him a Piece of Money, and every one an Ear-ring of Gold. This, without Question, alludes to the Presents which Ezra tells us the Jews of Babylon made to their Brethren in Judea: *And all they that were about them strengthened their Hands with Vessels of Silver, with Gold, with Goods, and with Beasts, and with precious Things, besides all that was willingly offered^g.*—So the Lord blessed the latter End of Job more than the Beginning^h. And thus was the future Prosperity of the People predicted of by the Prophets of this Time: *The Glory of this latter House shall be greater than the former, saith the Lord of Hosts: And in this Place will I give Peace, saith the Lord of Hostsⁱ.* For I, saith the Lord, will be unto her a Wall of Fire round about, and will be the Glory in the Midst of her^k.—The Book concludes in these Words: *After this lived Job an Hundred and Forty Years, and saw his Sons, and his Sons Sons, even four Generations. So Job died being old and full of Days^l.*

^b MAL. ii. 17.^c MAL. iii. 13.^d ZECH. viii. 3.^e Chap. xlii. v 10.^f ZECH. ix. 12.^g EZRA i. 6.^h Chap. xlii. v 12.ⁱ HAGGAI ii. 9.^k ZECH. ii. 5.^l Chap. xlii. v 16, 17.

This was the Blessing promised by God to the People in the Prophet *Zechariah*: *Thus saith the Lord of Hosts, There shall yet old Men and old Women dwell in the Streets of Jerusalem, and every Man with his Staff in his Hand for very Age. And the Streets of the City shall be full of Boys and Girls playing in the Streets thereof*^m.

2. The next Person of the Drama is *Job's Wife*. Let us consider her on the common Supposition. She acts a short Part indeed, but a very spirited one. *'Then said his Wife unto him: Dost thou still retain thine Integrity? Curse God and die*ⁿ. Tender and pious! He might see, by this Prelude of his *Spouse* what Entertainment he was to expect from his *Friends*. The *Devil* indeed assaulted *Job*, but he seems to have got Possession of his *Wife*. Happiness was so little to be expected with such a Woman, that, methinks, the sacred Writer, when he would give us the highest Idea of *Job's* succeeding Felicity, should have told us that he lived to bury his *Wife*. In these modern Ages of Luxury and refined Manners, a Character like this is so little uncommon, that both Learned and Unlearned are accustomed to read it without Emotion: But such a Woman in the Age of *Job* had been a Prodigy indeed. In the History of the Patriarchs we have large Accounts of their Wives; but they are all Examples of Piety, Tenderness, and Obedience; the natural Product of old Simplicity of Manners. Something lower down, indeed, we find a *Delilah*; but she was of the *Uncircumcised*, a pure Pagan; as, on Examination, I believe, this *Wife of Job* will prove: Another very extraordinary Circumstance in her Part. For the Patriarchs either took care to marry true Believers, or, if Idolaters, to in-

^m ZECH. viii. 4, 5.ⁿ Chap. ii. v. 9.

struct them in their own Religion; as we may see by the History of *Jacob*. — *Then said his Wife unto him, Dost thou still retain thine INTEGRITY? THUMMAH, Perfectio*, that is *Religion*. This was altogether in the Pagan Manners; Idolaters, as we find in ancient History, generally growing impious on Misfortunes; but the People of GOD, as we have observed before from Scripture, always more serious and religious. — *Curse God*, BARECH, *Benedic*; spoken ironically, and therefore well translated *Curse*. So the *Syr.* and *Arab.* Versions, *Conviciare Deo tuo*. This was another Pagan Practice when they had prayed to no Purpose. *Thucydides* affords us a terrible Instance: When the *Athenians* in the Height of their Prosperity went upon the *Syracusan* Expedition, the Fleet set sail amidst the Prayers and Hymns of the Adventurers: but on its unhappy Success these very Men, before their fatal Dispersion, prosecuted the same Gods with the direst Curses and Imprecations^o — *Curse God and DIE*; that is, dispatch yourself. Another Pagan Impiety; which thought Suicide, in Misfortunes, not only right but laudable. A Crime the *Jews* much abhorred, as forbidden by their Law, till, in After-times, they became corrupted by Gentile Manners. All this shews the Woman to have been a rank Idolater. But *Job's* Reply puts it out of question: *Thou speakest as one of the FOOLISH Women speaketh. What? Shall we receive Good at the Hand of God, and shall we not receive Evil^p? A foolish Woman is a Jewish Expression to signify a foreign Woman, an Idolater, an Adulteress*; for these Characters were always joined together in their Ideas. On this Account the *Chald. Paraph.* explains it, *Sicut una de*

^o — ἀντὶ δ' ὀχῆς τε καὶ πασιάνων, μετ' ὧν ἐξέπλεον, πάλιν τέτρω τοῖς ἐναντίοις ἐπιφημίσμασιν ἀφορμαῖς. Lib. vii. § 75. Ed. Hud.

^p Chap. ii. § 10.

mulieribus quæ operantur ignominiam in domo patris sui. So *David*, speaking of the Condition of the Pagan World, says: *The Fool hath said in his Heart*^a, for the *Pagan*; and in the Character *Job* gives of the *Cutheans*, quoted above, he calls them *Children of Fools*^r; that is, of Gentile Extract, as indeed they were. Now can we suppose that *Job* would marry an *Infidel*, in a Country that abounded with true Believers? *Job*, who thought Idolatry a Crime to be punished by the Judge? These are difficulties never to be got over on the common Idea of this Book; and appeared so great to *Cocceius* and *Schultens*, the two most elaborate of *Job*'s Commentators, that they are for glossing the Woman's Words into an innocent or excusable Sense; tho' *Job*'s Reply so unavoidably confines them to the common one: *Thou speakest* (says he) *as one of the foolish Women speaketh.* What? Shall we receive Good at the Hand of God, and shall we not receive Evil? Besides, they did not consider that *Satan* had, as it were, engaged that *Job* should curse God to his Face^s; which Impiety he was here endeavouring to bring about by his Agent, the Woman. But now on our Interpretation, we shall find this Character introduced with exquisite Art and Contrivance. We have observed, that this Remnant of the Captivity returned into their own Country with Hearts full of Zeal for the Law; yet, with this general good Disposition, there was one Folly they were still infected with, and that was the taking strange Wives of the idolatrous Nations round about. This soon became a crying Enormity. Their Prophets awaked them with the Thunder of Divine Menaces; and their Rulers improved their Penitence to a thorough Re-

^a PSAL. xiv. 1. — liii. 1.

^r Chap. xxx. v 8.

^s Chap. ii. v 5.

formation.

formation. *Judah* (saith the Prophet *Malachi*) *bath* dealt treacherously, and an *Abomination* is committed in *Israel* and in *Jerusalem*: For *Judah* *bath* profaned the Holiness of the Lord which he loved, and *bath* married the Daughter of a strange God. The Lord will cut off the Man that doth this^t. *Nehemiah* tells us of his Zeal against this Offence: In those Days also saw I Jews that had married Wives of *Ashdod*, of *Ammon*, and of *Moab*: And I contended with them, and cursed them, and smote certain of them, and pluckt off their Hair, and made them swear by God, saying, Ye shall not give your Daughters unto their Sons, nor take their Daughters unto your Sons, or for yourselves^v. But *Ezra* gives us a very circumstantial Account of the Crime and the Reformation of it: Now when these Things were done, the Princes came to me, saying, The People of *Israel*, and the Priests, and the Levites have not separated themselves from the People of the Lands, doing according to their Abominations: For they have taken of their Daughters for themselves and for their Sons; so that the holy Seed have mingled themselves with the People of those Lands: Yea the Hand of the Princes and Rulers *bath* been chief in this Trespass^w. *Shechaniah* then encourages *Ezra* to reform this Abuse^x. *Ezra* assembles the People^y; they promise Amendment, and propose the Method of Enquiry: Let now our Rulers of all the Congregation stand, and let all them which have taken strange Wives in our Cities, come at appointed Times, and with them the Elders of every City, and the Judges thereof^z. *Ezra* approved of this Method, And they sat down in the first Day of the tenth Month to examine the Matter. And they made an End with all the Men that had taken strange Wives by the first

^t MAL. ii. 11, 12.^v NEHEM. xiii. 23, 25.^w EZRA ix. 1, 2.^x Chap. x. § 2.^y § 7.^z § 14.

Day of the first Month^a. Their Circumstance of a weak and thin Colony, 'tis probable, encouraged them in this Transgression; yet as it was so expressly against the *Law*, they were altogether without Excuse: and indeed, the Prohibition was an admirable Expedient against Idolatry; *strange Wives* inevitably drawing them into it. On this Account the Prophet quoted above, finely calls them *the Daughter of a strange God*. *Jeremiah* gives us a remarkable Instance of their Influence over their Husbands in his Time: *Then all the Men which knew that their Wives had burnt Incense unto other Gods, and all the Women that stood by, a great Multitude, even all the People that dwelt in the Land of Egypt, in Pathros, answered Jeremiah, saying, As for the Word that thou hast spoken unto us in the Name of the Lord, we will not hearken unto thee*^b. And *Nehemiah* had good Reason to tell these Transgressors, *Did not Solomon King of Israel sin by these Things? Yet among many Nations was there no King like him, who was beloved of his God, and God made him King over all Israel: Nevertheless even him did outlandish Women cause to sin*^c. For *Ezra* expressly assures us, that those who had taken strange Women were drawn into *the Abominations of the People of the Lands*^d.

The sacred Writer, therefore, who composed his Work for the Use of these People, represented under the Person of *Job*, could not better characterize them, nor give them a more useful Lesson, than by making *Job's* Wife a *Heathen*, and the Author of such wicked Counsel. It was indeed the principal Study of their Rulers to deter them from these Marriages, and to recommend the Daughters of *Israel*; of whom the Prophet *Malachi* thus speaks:

^a Chap. x. v. 16, 17.^b JER. xlv. 15.^c NEH. xiii. 26.^d EZRA ix. 1.

Because

Because the Lord hath been Witness between thee and the Wife of thy Youth, against whom thou hast dealt treacherously: Yet is she thy Companion, and the Wife of thy Covenant^e. This will help us to clear up a Difficulty in the Conclusion of the Book, which very much perplexes the Commentators: So the Lord blessed the latter End of Job — He had also seven Sons and three Daughters. And he called the Name of the first Jemima, and the Name of the second Kezia, and the Name of the third Keren-happuch. And in all the Land were no Women found so fair as the Daughters of Job, and their Father gave them Inheritance among their Brethren^f. Albert Schultens says^g:

*“ Cur suppressis Filiorum nominibus, Filiarum illa
“ apposita sint, quæri solet. Ad Mystrium confu-
“ giunt veteres, mire ludentes in Etymis Jemimæ,
“ Ketziæ, & Keren-happuchæ, sive Dianæ vel Diei,
“ Cassiæ, & Cornu stibii, ut vulgato hæc convenire
“ visum. In his inveniunt totidem characteres Ec-
“ clesiæ, quæ cum splendore lucis conjungat odorem
“ fragrantissimum virtutis, ut tota pulchra sponso
“ suo sistatur, &c. &c. Alii symbolicas has faci-
“ unt appellationes, quibus familiæ suæ redivivam
“ lucem, famam, gloriam repræsentatam voluerit
“ fortunatissimus pater. Erud. de Pined. longe la-
“ teque tanquam per amœna vireta his spatatus.”*

And Mr. Le Clerc on the same Place: Quæritur cur sint filiarum nomina memorata, non filiorum; cujus rei ratio reddi non potest, nisi fortè illustriores fuerint filiæ. Hæc nomina proferuntur, ut argumentum certum, quo constet hanc veram esse historiam, sed quis dicat quò usque Orientales parabolas ornare solebant? In parabola Evangelica est quidem nomen Lazari, quod non obstat quo minus Parabola habeatur. Verum rem in medio relinquimus. But now all this Obscurity is

^e MAL. ii. 14.

^f Chap. xlii. v 12, & seq.

^g In loc.

cleared up, and the Passage is seen in its native Beauty. It was the Writer's Design to recommend the *Daughters of Israel* as the most desirable Parties, — *And in all the Land were no Women found so fair as the Daughters of Job*; — and to commemorate the Reformation now made amongst the People, when they put away their strange Wives, and took an Oath to share the holy Inheritance, for the future, only with the *Daughters of Israel*, — *And their Father gave them Inheritance amongst their Brethren*: Words that have been as troublesome to the Commentators as the rest; and have occasioned many a learned Dissertation *de Jure Successionis apud Hebræos, Arabas, Græcos, Latinos, & quamplurimas Gentes*.

3. We come next to *Job's* THREE FRIENDS. — Their solemn Appointment to go and comfort *Job*; the Neglect of their Errand when they came thither; their Inhumanity and Humour of Contradiction have been already taken notice of, and explained and reconciled on the Nature and Principles of a *dramatic* Composition. But this was not all; we find, on the Issue of their Debate, so many Marks of Insult, Falshood, and Malice, that we must needs conclude their Friendship to be all feigned; that they were Enemies in their Hearts; and that the true Purpose of their Visit was to im-bitter and aggravate his Miseries. This requires other Principles to explain it: For, in the *historical* Part they are represented as *real* Friends; and this makes such a Difficulty as nothing but our Idea of the Work can remove. Who then will doubt but that, as the People were represented under *Job*, these *three Friends* were their three capital Enemies, who so much hindered and obstructed the rebuilding *Jerusalem* and the Temple, SANBALLAT, TOBIAH, and GESHEM? Of whom *Nehemiah* gives us

us this Account: *Then I came to the Governors beyond the River, and gave them the King's Letters. When Sanballat the Horonite, and Tobiah the Servant the Ammonite, heard of it, it grieved them exceedingly that there was come a Man to seek the Welfare of the Children of Israel*^h. And again: *But it came to pass that when Sanballat, and Tobiah, and the Arabians, and the Ammonites, and the Ashdodites heard that the Walls of Jerusalem were made up, and that the Breaches began to be stopped, then they were very wroth, and conspired all of them together, to come and to fight against Jerusalem and to hinder it*ⁱ. When Force would not do, they assayed Fraud: Now it came to pass when SANBALLAT, and TOBIAH, and GESHEM the Arabian, and the rest of our Enemies heard that I had builded the Wall, and that there was no Breach left therein, then Sanballat and Geshem, sent unto me, saying, Come, let us meet together in some one of the Villages in the Plain of Ono: but they thought to do me Mischief^k. The Writer of the Book of Tobit seems to have had this Idea of the three Friends, where he says: *Nam sicut beato Job insultabant reges, ita isti parentes & cognati ejus irridebant vitam ejus*^l. But we are to observe this is now only to be found in the Latin Translation, which St. Jerom tells us he made from the Chaldee.

The Marks of Resemblance between the allegorical and real Persons, are many and strong.

Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar are delivered as the Allies and Friends of *Job*: So *Sanballat the Horonite* had given his Daughter to one of the Sons of *Joiada* the Son of *Eliashib* the High Priest^m: And *Tobiah* had made two Alliances with the Jews. His

^h NEHEM. ii. 9, 10.

^k Chap. vi. § 1, 2.

^m NEHEM. xiii. 28.

ⁱ Chap. iv. § 7, 8.

^l TOB. ii. 14.

Son *Johanan* had married the Daughter of *Mesbulam* the Son of *Berechiah*; and he himself had taken to Wife the Daughter of *Shechaniah* the Son of *Arah*ⁿ.

Eliphaz, *Bildad*, and *Zophar* came in a friendly manner with Offers of Service and Assistance: So did these Enemies of the *Jews*, as we are informed both by *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*: “Now when the
“ADVERSARIES of *Judah* and *Benjamin* heard that
“the Children of the Captivity builded the Temple unto the Lord God of *Israel*: Then they
“came to *Zerubbabel*, and to the Chief of the Fathers, and said unto them, LET US BUILD WITH
“YOU. But *Zerubbabel* and *Jeshua* and the rest of
“the Chief of the Fathers of *Israel*, said unto them,
“You have nothing to do with us to build a House
“unto our God, but we ourselves will build unto
“the Lord God of *Israel*, as King *Cyrus* the King
“of *Persia* hath commanded us^o.” And *Nehemiah*’s Answer to *Sanballat*, *Tobiah*, and *Geshem* shews they had made this Request: “Then answered
“I them and said unto them, The God of Heaven
“he will prosper us; therefore we his Servants will
“arise and build, *but you have no Portion, nor*
“*Right, nor Memorial in Jerusalem*^p.” And of *Tobiah* in particular he says: *Moreover in those Days the Nobles of Judah sent many Letters unto Tobiah: and the Letters of Tobiah came unto them. Also they reported his good Deeds before me, and uttered my Words to him. And Tobiah sent Letters to put me in Fear*^q.

The *three Friends* of *Job* were Worshippers of the true God; and so were these *Adversaries* of the *Jews*: For when, in the Place quoted above, they asked to *build with the Jews*, they give this Reason

ⁿ NEH. vi. 18.

^o EZRA iv. 1, 2, 3.

^p NEH. ii. 20.

^q NEH. vi. 17, 19.

of their Request: FOR WE SEEK YOUR GOD *as ye do, and we do sacrifice unto him since the Days of Eferhaddon King of Affur, which brought us up hither^r.*

The three Friends were perpetually deriding him and upbraiding him with his Sins: And of this *Job* frequently complains in the Course of the Disputation^s. So *Nehemiah* tells us, that *when Sanballat the Horonite, and Tobiah the Servant the Ammonite, and Geshem the Arabian heard that they were set upon building the Walls of Jerusalem, they laughed them to scorn, and despised them, and said, What is this thing that ye do? Will ye rebel against the King^t? And again: But it came to pass that when Sanballat heard that we builded the Wall, he was wroth, and took great Indignation, and mocked the Jews. Now Tobiah the Ammonite was by him, and he said, Even that which they build, if a Fox go up, he shall even break down their Stone Wall^v. God, by the Prophet Malachi, tells them why he had made them thus contemptible to their Neighbours: Therefore have I also made you contemptible and base before all the People, according as ye have not kept my Ways, but have been partial in the Law. — For Judah hath profaned the Holiness of the Lord which he loved, and hath married the Daughter of a strange God^w. And it is remarkable that they with whom they had committed this Crime, as Sanballat, and Tobiah, and the Cutbeans, were made the Instruments of their Punishment. — Eliphaz the Temanite charges and upbraids *Job* with the most flagitious Crimes: Is not thy Wickedness great, and thine Iniquities infinite^x? And thus the Cutbeans represented*

^r EZRA iv. 2. ^s Chap. vi. § 27. Chap. xii. § 4. Chap. xiii. § 4. Chap. xvi. § 1, 20. Chap. xvii. § 2. Chap. xix. § 2. Chap. xxi. § 3. Chap. xxvi. § 4. ^t NEHEM. ii. 19.

^v Chap. iv. § 1, 3. ^w MAL. ii. 11. ^x Chap. xxii. § 5.

the *Jews* to *Artaxerxes*: “ Be it known unto the
 “ King, that the *Jews* which came up from thee
 “ to us, are come unto *Jerusalem*, building the re-
 “ bellious and the bad City, and have set up the
 “ Walls thereof. — Therefore have we certified
 “ the King that Search may be made in the Book
 “ of the Records of thy Fathers, so shalt thou find
 “ in the Book of the Records, and know, that this
 “ City is a rebellious City, and hurtful unto Kings
 “ and Provinces; and that they have moved Sedi-
 “ tion within the same of old Time; for which
 “ Cause was this City destroyed^y. — If their Ad-
 versaries would accuse them thus unjustly, we are
 not to think they would spare them where there
 was more Ground for Censure. When *Nebemiab*
 came to the Administration of Affairs, the Rich had
 oppressed the Poor by a rigorous Exaction of their
 Debts: *And there was a great Cry of the People and*
of their Wives, against their Brethren the Jews. For
there were that said, We, our Sons, and our Daugh-
ters are many: therefore we take up Corn for them,
that we may eat and live. Some also there were that
said, We have mortgaged our Lands, Vineyards, and
Houses, that we may buy Corn because of the Dearth.
There were also that said, We have borrowed Money
for the King's Tribute, and that upon our Lands and
Vineyards. Yet now our Flesh is as the Flesh of our
Brethren, our Children as their Children: And lo we
bring into Bondage our Sons and our Daughters to be
Servants, and some of our Daughters are brought into
Bondage already, neither is it in our Power to redeem
them: For other Men have our Lands and Vineyards^z.
 This Abuse *Nebemiab* reformed; and in reproving
 the Oppressors, he said: *It is not good that ye do:*
Ought ye not to walk in the Fear of our Lord because

^y EZRA IV. 12, 14, 15.^z NEH. V. 1, & seq.

of the REPROACH OF THE HEATHEN OUR ENEMIES^a; which *Reproach* was intended to be represented in these Words of *Eliphaz*: *For thou hast taken a Pledge from thy Brother for Nought, and stripped the Naked of their Clothing*^b.

But the three Friends are at length condemned by God himself: *The Lord said to Eliphaz the Temanite: My Wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy two Friends: For ye have not spoken of me the Thing that is right, as my Servant Job hath*^c. And in the same Manner he speaks, by the Prophet, concerning these Adversaries of the *Jews*: *And I am very sore displeased with the Heathen that are AT EASE: For I was but a LITTLE DISPLEASED, and they HELPED FORWARD THE AFFLICTION*^d. — His Sentence against the three Friends goes on in these Words: *Therefore take now unto you seven Bullocks and seven Rams, and go to my Servant Job and offer up for yourselves a Burnt-Offering, and my Servant Job shall pray for you, for him will I accept: Lest I deal with you after your Folly, in that ye have not spoken of me the Thing which is right like my Servant Job*^e. This, I suppose, is designed to represent the Defeat of their Adversaries, in the Decree which the *Jews*, by the good Providence of God, procured from *Darius*, commanding them, who had hitherto so much hindered, now to assist the *Jews* to the utmost of their Power in rebuilding the Temple: “Then *Darius* the King made a Decree — Now therefore *Tatnai* Governor beyond the River, *Shethar-boznai* and your Companions the *Apharsachites*, which are beyond the River, be ye far from thence: Let the Work of this House of God alone, let the Governor of the

^a y 9.

^b Chap. xxii. y 6.

^c Chap. xlii. y 7.

^d ZECH. i. 15.

^e Chap. xlii. y 8.

“ *Jews*, and the Elders of the *Jews* build this House
 “ of God in his Place. Moreover I make a De-
 “ cree, what ye shall do to the Elders of these *Jews*,
 “ for the Building of this House of God: that, of
 “ the King’s Goods, even of the Tribute beyond the
 “ River, forthwith Expences be given unto these
 “ Men, that they be not hindered. And that which
 “ they have need of, both young *Bullocks*, and
 “ *Rams*, and *Lambs*, for the BURNT-OFFERINGS
 “ of the God of Heaven, *Wheat*, *Salt*, *Wine*, and
 “ *Oil*, according to the Appointment of the Priests
 “ which are at *Jerusalem*, let it be given them Day
 “ by Day without fail; that they may offer Sacri-
 “ fices of sweet Savours unto the God of Heaven,
 “ and pray FOR THE LIFE OF THE KING AND OF
 “ HIS SONS^f.”

The Reason why the three Friends are condemned
 as *not having spoken of God the Thing that was right*
 is, 1. Because they used the Argument of an *equal*
Providence only to condemn *Job* with the Heart of
 an Enemy; 2. Because the Writer’s Purpose was to
 reconcile the People by Degrees to an *unequal Pro-*
vidence.

4. The last Person in the Opposition is the *Devil*
 himself, SATAN, the Author and Contriver of all
 the Mischief. And now we are come to that Part
 of the *Allegory*, where the *Fable* and the *Moral* meet,
 and, as it were, concur to throw off the Mask, and
 expose the true Face of the Subject; this Assault
 of *Satan* upon *Job* being the very Assault that the
 Prophet *Zechariah* tells us he made, at this Time,
 on the *People*. The only Difference is, that, in the
 Prophecy, *Joshua the High Priest* stands for the
People; and, in this Poem, *Job*: In all the rest,
 the Identity is so strongly supported, that this sin-

^f EZRA vi. 1, 6, & seq.

gle Circumstance is, alone, sufficient to confirm the Truth of our whole Interpretation. There needs only setting the two Passages together to convince the most incredulous: “Now there was a Day when
“ the Sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and *Satan* came also among them.
“ And the Lord said unto *Satan*: Whence comest thou? Then *Satan* answered the Lord, and said,
“ From going to and fro in the Earth, and from walking up and down in it. And the Lord said unto *Satan*: Hast thou considered my Servant
“ *Job*, that there is none like him in the Earth, a perfect and an upright Man, one that feareth God and escheweth Evil? Then *Satan* answered the Lord and said: Doth *Job* fear God for nought?—
“ But put forth thine Hand now, and touch all that he hath, and he will curse thee to thy Face.
“ And the Lord said unto *Satan*: Behold all that he hath is in thy Power, only upon himself put not forth thine Hand. So *Satan* went forth from the Presence of the Lord^s.” The *Prophet’s* Account is in these Words: “Be silent, O all Flesh, before the Lord; for he is raised up out of his
“ holy Habitation. And he shewed me *Joshua* the high Priest standing before the Angel of the
“ Lord, and *Satan* standing at his Right Hand to resist him. And the Lord said unto *Satan*: The
“ Lord rebuke thee, O *Satan*, even the Lord that hath chosen *Jerusalem*, rebuke thee: Is not this a
“ Brand pluckt out of the Fire? Now *Joshua* was clothed with filthy Garments, and stood before the
“ Angel. And he answered and spake unto those that stood before him, saying, *Take away* the filthy Garments from him. And unto him he said,
“ Behold I have caused thine Iniquity to pass from thee,

^s Chap. i. v 6, & seq.

“ and

“ and I will clothe thee with Change of Raiment.
 “ And I said, Let them set a fair Mitre upon his
 “ Head; so they set a fair Mitre upon his Head,
 “ and clothed him with Garments, and *the Angel of*
 “ *the Lord stood by*^h.” *Job’s* whole Dramatic Life
 lies here in its *Stamina*. — *Satan standing at the An-*
gel’s Right Hand to resist Joshua is, when drawn out
 more at length, his *Persecution of Job*. — *Joshua*
clothed with filthy Garments, is Job amongst the Ashes.
 — The *clothing Joshua with Change of Raiment,*
and setting a fair Mitre on his Head, is *Job’s* return-
 ing Prosperity. — *And the Angel of the Lord standing*
by, is *GOD’s* Interposition from the *Whirlwind*. —
 Hence we have a convincing Argument of their
 Mistake, who suppose the Preface by a different
 Hand from that which wrote the Body of the
 Book.

But we have not yet done with this Character.
 The finding *Satan* in the Scene is a certain Proof
 that the Work was composed in the Age we assign
 to it. This evil Being was little known to the *Peo-*
ple till about this Time. Their great Legislator,
 where he warns them so frequently of all the Snares
 and Temptations that would draw them to trans-
 gress the Law of God, never once mentions this
 capital Enemy of Heaven; yet this was a Precau-
 tion the wisest Pagan Lawgiversⁱ thought of use to
 keep the Populace in the Ways of Virtue: And
 when the Course of that sacred History which he
 composed obliged him to treat of *Satan’s* first grand
 Machination against Mankind, he entirely hides
 him under that Animal which he made his Instru-
 ment. (The Reason of this Divine Conduct has
 been explained in Part already, and will be more

^h ZECH. ii. 13. Chap. iii. v 1, & seq.

ⁱ See *Div. Leg.* Vol. i. p. 125. Ed. 2.

exactly treated of in the Course of our general Argument^k.) But, as the Fulness of Time drew on, they were made more and more acquainted with this evil Spirit. When *Abab*, for the Crimes and Follies of the People, was to be infatuated, we have this Account of the Matter in the *First Book of Kings*: *And Micaiah said, Hear thou therefore the Word of the Lord: I saw the Lord sitting on his Throne, and all the Host of Heaven standing by him, on his Right Hand and on his Left. And the Lord said: Who shall persuade Ahab that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-Gilead? And one said on this manner, and another said on that manner. And there came forth a Spirit and stood before the Lord, and said, I will persuade him. And the Lord said unto him: Wherewith? And he said, I will go forth, and I will be a lying Spirit in the Mouth of all his Prophets. And he said, Thou shalt persuade him, and prevail also; Go forth and do so*^l. *Satan* is not here named; and so we must believe they were yet to know little of his History; however this Undertaking sufficiently declared his Nature. On the Return from the Captivity we find him better known; and Things then ascribed to him, as the *immediate* and *proper* Author, which (while the Divine Providence thought fit to keep back the Knowledge of him till his appointed Time) were before given, in an *improper* Sense, to the *first* and *ultimate* Cause of all Things. Thus, in the *Second Book of Samuel* it is said, that *God* moved *David* to number the People, *And again*

^k But as Divine Wisdom procures many *Ends* by one and the same *Means*; so we may see here, that, besides this Use (in throwing the Reader's Attention entirely on the *Serpent*) it had another, *viz.* to make the *Serpent*, which was of the most sacred and venerable Regard in the mysterious Religion of *Egypt*, the Object of the *Israelites'* utter Abhorrence and Detestation.

^l 1 KINGS xxii. 19, & seq.

the Anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he moved David against them to say, Go number Israel and Judah^m. But in the *First Book of Chronicles*, which was wrote after the Captivity, *Satan* is said to have moved *David* to it: *And Satan stood up against Israel, and provoked David to number Israel*ⁿ. For his History having an inseparable Connexion with the *Redemption* of Mankind, the Knowledge of it must needs keep equal Pace with this: And their later Prophets had now given very lively Descriptions of that and its attendant Truths. And here let us stop a Moment, tho' I anticipate my Subject, to adore the visible Splendor of Divine Wisdom in this Period of God's grand Dispensation: We observed that the Fulness of Time approaching, the Writings of the Prophets had given very plain Intimations of the *Redemption*; and that the Truths, which had a necessary Connexion with it, were proportionably laid open. Two of the principal of these were the *History of Satan* and the *Doctrine of a Future State*, which, soon after this Time, came to their Knowledge. Now besides the Wisdom of this general Oeconomy, these two Truths were of the highest Utility to the *Jewish* People at those very Junctures when first made known unto them. The History of *Satan*, it is evident, they were acquainted with in their Captivity^o, and nothing could better secure them from the dangerous Error of the *two Principles*, which was Part of the national

^m 2 SAM. xxiv. 1.ⁿ 1 CHRON. xxi. 1.

^o And yet we have Heads weighty enough to get to the Bottom of this Matter. They seem in good earnest to believe that the *Jews* had their Notion of *Satan* from the People amongst whom they lived captive. And why not? He that can really think the Writers of the *New Testament* argued against the Truth of the *Old*, may believe that the *Jews* learnt to refute the Error of the *two Principles* of that Nation by which the Error was propagated, as a fundamental Principle of Religion.

Religion of the Country into which they were led captive. The Doctrine of a *Future State* they learnt some small Time after their thorough Reestablishment; and this being at a Time when their *extraordinary* Providence was departed from them was of the highest Advantage and Support to them, as a Nation and a People. But this, as I say, is *anticipating* my Subject, and will be explained at large hereafter: The other is the Point we are now concerned with, namely, the Knowledge of this wicked Spirit, and its Security against the Error of the *two Principles*; which leads us to another Use the Writer of the Book of *Job* made of this *Personage* of the *Drama*.

We have observed that the principal Design of the Author of this Work was to remove all Errors concerning the supreme Cause, from amongst a People now about to come under the *ordinary Providence* of God, who had been long accustomed to the *extraordinary*. The commonest Fault the Ancients were prone to fall into, on seeing *good* and *bad* happen *indifferently* to Men, was to call in Question the Goodness of God. Against these Doubts therefore our Author has principally provided. But they were extremely apt to satisfy themselves, on this Point, by another Mistake as bad, which was that of TWO PRINCIPLES, a *good* and an *evil*. And the *Jews*, of this Time, were most obnoxious to the Danger, as coming from a Place where this Opinion made Part of the public Religion. It was therefore of highest Importance to guard against so fatal an Error. And this the sacred Writer very effectually does, by shewing that *Satan*, or the *evil Spirit* (whose History, misunderstood, or imperfectly told, in the first Ages of Mankind, much favoured the Notion of an *evil Principle*) was, like all other superior, immaterial Beings, a Creature of God,

GOD, at enmity with him, yet entirely in his Power, and used by him as an Instrument to punish wicked Men; and sometimes to afflict the Good, for a Trial of their Patience, and to render their Faith and Virtue more perfect and illustrious. Hence we at length see how useful it was to this Purpose (how little Light soever it gave to the Question) to resolve all, when the Dispute came to be moderated and determined, into the Omnipotence of GOD, who is represented as the *sole* Creator and Governor of all Things. The admirable Writer above quoted, who always throws new Light on every obscure Subject, as well as new Graces on every common one he undertakes to treat of, saw plainly that this was one of the Purposes of the Work before us. *The Book* (says he) *was written in Opposition to the very ancient Opinion which introduced two independent Principles, one of Good, the other of Evil*^p. — What the Wisdom of the Holy Spirit directed the Writer of the Book of *Job* to do, in this Point, on their Return from the Land which held the Belief of *two Principles*, the same Wisdom directed *Isaiab* to do, on their going *thither*. GOD, in this Prophet, addressing his Speech to *Cyrus*, whom he had appointed the Instrument of his People's Restoration, says: *I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God besides me. I girded thee, though thou hast not known me. — I FORM THE LIGHT and CREATE DARKNESS, I MAKE PEACE and CREATE EVIL: I the Lord do all these Things*^q.

5. The last Actor, in this Representation, is *Job's fourth Friend ELIHU, the Son of Barachel the Buzite*, who is brought upon the Stage in the *thirty second Chapter*. He is made to reprove *Job*

^p *Use and Intent of Prophecy, &c.* p. 207.

^q *Is.* xlv. 5, 7.

with

with great Asperity; and, like the other *three*, to have his *Wrath* kindled against him: and yet, to the great Surprise of all the Commentators, he is not involved in the same Sentence with them, when God passes Judgment on the Controversy. Here again, the only Solution of the Difficulty is our Interpretation. As severe as he was, his was the Severity of a true Friend; theirs the Malice of false ones. For under the Person of *Elibu* was designed the *sacred Writer himself*. All this will appear from the following Considerations.

Elibu, on the Entrance on his Argument, addresses the three Friends in these Words: *Now he hath not directed his Words against me: neither will I answer him with your Speeches*^r. Which sufficiently discriminates his Cause and Character from theirs. He then turns to *Job*: “My Words (says he) shall be of the *Uprightness* of my Heart; and “my Lips shall utter *Knowledge* clearly. The “*Spirit of God hath made me*, and the *Breath of* “*the Almighty* hath given me *Life*. If thou canst “answer me, set thy Words in order before me, “stand up. *Behold I am according to thy Wish in* “*God’s stead*: I also am formed out of the “*Clay*,” &c. This clearly intimates the Character of God’s chosen Servant. Thus the Prophets were in God’s stead to the People. And *Elibu* speaks exactly in their Strain. — He excites *Job* to Attention, — accuses him of charging God with Injustice, — reproves his Impiety, — tells him that Men cry in their Afflictions, and are not heard for want of Faith: — That his Sins hinder God’s Blessings, whose Wisdom and Ways are all unsearchable. But is this the Conversation of one private Man to another? Is it not rather a public Exhortation of a

^r Chap. xxxii. v 14.^s Chap. xxxiii. v 3, & seq.

Jewish Prophet to the People? And now we may see the great Propriety of that Allusion to the Case of *Hezekiah*^t mentioned above, which the Writer in this Place puts into the Mouth of *Elibu*. The Spirit with which *Elibu* speaks is farther seen from his telling *Job* that *he desires to justify him*^v. And yet he accuses him with saying, *It profiteth a Man nothing, that he should delight himself with God*^w; and expostulates with him thus: *Thinkest thou this to be right, that thou saidst, My Righteousness is more than God's? For thou saidst, What Advantage will it be unto thee, and what Profit shall I have, if I be cleansed from my Sin*^x? Here the Commentators are much scandalized. Yet he says no more of *Job* than what the *Prophets* say of the *People*, represented under him. Thus *Malachi*: “Ye have
 “wearied the Lord with your Words: yet ye say,
 “Wherein have we wearied him? When ye say,
 “Every one that doth Evil is good in the Sight of the
 “Lord, and he delighteth in them; or, where is the
 “God of Judgment^y? ” And again: *Ye have said, It is vain to serve God: and what Profit is it, that we have kept his Ordinance, and that we have walked mournfully before the Lord of Hosts? And now we call the Proud happy: Yea they that work Wickedness are set up; yea they that tempt God are even delivered*^z. It was this that kindled *Elibu's* Wrath against *Job*. And that *Job* was really guilty of this Crime, in this representative History of him, appears from the Beginning of God's Speech to him^a; and his own Confession^b. It is remarkable that *Job*, from the Beginning of his Misfortunes to the coming of his three Comforters, though greatly

^t Chap. xxxiii. v. 18, & seq.

^v Chap. xxxiii. v. 32.

^w Chap. xxxiv. v. 9.

^x Chap. xxxv. v. 2, 3.

^y MAL. ii. 17.

^z MAL. iii. 14, 15.

^a Chap. xxxviii.

v. 2.

^b Chap. xlii. v. 1, & seq.

provoked

provoked by his Wife, *sinned not* (as we are told) *with his Lips*^c. But, persecuted by the Malice and Bitterness of their Words, he began to lay so much Stress on his Innocence as even to accuse GOD's Justice. This was the very State of the *Jews* of this Time: so exactly has the sacred Writer conducted his Allegory. They bore their Straits and Difficulties with Temper, till their Adversaries *Sanballat, Tobiah*, and the *Arabians* gave them so much Disturbance; and then they fell into indecent Murmurs against GOD. And here let us observe, that in this lies the Difference between *Elibu* and the *three Friends*. They accuse *Job* of *preceding* Faults; He of the *present*, namely, his *Impatience* and *Impiety*: consequently *his* Charge was *true*, and *theirs unjust*.

Again, *Elibu* uses the *very same* Arguments against *Job* and his three Friends^d, that are afterwards put into the Mouth of GOD himself^e, resolving all into his Omnipotency. *Elibu's* Speech is, indeed, in all Respects, the same with GOD's, excepting the Severity of his Reproof to *Job*. And, in that, the Writer has shewn his Art. The End and Purpose of this Work was to encourage the *Jews* to a Perseverance in their Duty, by the assured Care and Protection of Providence: At the same Time, as they were growing impatient, it was necessary this Temper should be reproved. But as the Ordonance of the Poem is disposed, the putting the Reproofs into the Mouth of the Almighty would have greatly weakened the End and Purpose of the Work. This Part therefore is given to his Servant *Elibu*: and GOD's Sentence is all Grace and Favour on the Side of *Job*, and Indignation and Resentment against

^c Chap. ii. v. 10.^d From Chap. xxxii to xxxvii.^e From Chap. xxxviii to xlii.

his *false Friends*. The judicious Reader will observe another artful Circumstance in the Cast of *Elibu's* Speech. The three Friends, in the grand Question concerning an equal Providence, went directly over to one side, and *Job* to another: *Elibu* inclines to neither, but resolves all into Submission to the Almighty Power of God. For it was yet inconvenient to acquaint the *Jews*, who were now going to fall under a *common Providence*, with the Truth of the Case. Hence (to observe it by the way) another Circumstance arises to determine the Date of this Poem. We have shewn that the *Subject* suited only this Time: We now see that the *Manner* of treating the Subject could agree to no other. On the whole, this Speech of *Elibu's* was the finest Preparative imaginable for that decisive one which was to follow.

Farther, the true Character of *Elibu* is seen from hence, that *Job* replies nothing to him, as conscious of the Truth of his Reproofs; and that they were the Reproofs of a *Friend*. And, indeed, his Submission, on this Occasion, was to represent that of the *Jews* on the preaching of their Prophets, *Haggai*, *Zechariah*, and *Malachi*.

But lastly, his not being involved in the Condemnation of the *three Friends* is the most convincing Proof of his very different Character. This, as we shall see, exceedingly perplexed the Commentators. But where was the Wonder of his Acquittal, when he had said nothing but what God himself repeated and confirmed? What is rather to be admired is the severe Sentence passed upon the *three Friends*, for *Impiety*. A thing utterly inexplicable on the common Interpretation. For let them be as guilty as they would to *Job*, they are, all the way, Advocates for God; and hold nothing concerning him that did not become his Nature and Providence.

But

But once suppose these *three Friends* represent the Adversaries of the *Jews*, and the Difficulty vanishes. Their Pretences are then all *hypocritical*: and they impiously assume the Patronage of God only to carry on their Malice against *Job* to more Advantage. Why the Writer of this Book did not openly expose the Wickedness of their Hearts, as is done in the Books of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*, was because the Nature of the Work would not suffer it; the Question in Debate, and the Managers of the Question, necessarily requiring that the Part they took should have a specious Outside of Piety and Veneration toward God. In a word, *Job* is made to say something *wrong*, because he represents the impatient *Jews* of that Time: His *three false Friends*, to say something *right*, because the Nature of the Drama so required: And *Elihu* to moderate with *perfect Rectitude*, because he represented the Prophet.

But to see the Truth of this Interpretation in its best Light, one should have before ones Eyes all that Embarras and Perplexity with which the Commentators of the Book of *Job* are entangled at almost every Step. A View of this would draw us into an unreasonable Length. I shall only take notice of one of the most judicious of them (who has collected from all the rest) in the very Case of this *Elihu*. *Calmet* characterises the *fourth Friend* in this manner: *There was now none but Elihu the youngest and least judicious that held out against Job's Arguments — Elihu here by a vain Parade and Overflow of Words gives a Reason^f, &c.* Again: *Elihu was given to represent one who knew not how to be*

^f Il n'y eut qu'Eliu, qui étoit le plus jeune & le moins judicieux, qui ne se rendit pas — par un vain étalage des paroles Eliu rend ici raison, &c. *Sur C. xxxii. v. 1.*

silent, a great Talker^g. And again : *It cannot be denied but that there is a Mixture of Ignorance and Presumption in what Elihu says; and, above all, a strange Prejudice and visible Injustice in most of the Accusations he brings against Job*^h. This he says. But when he comes to find *Elihu* escape God's Condemnation, in which the other *three* are involved, he alters his Tone, and unsays all the hard Things he had thrown out against him. *Although Elihu* (says he) *had mistaken the Sense of his Friend's Words, yet, for all that, God seems, at least, to have approved his Intention, because when he declares to Job's Friends that they had spoken amiss, and commands them to offer up Burnt-Offerings for themselves, he only speaks of Bildad, Eliphaz, and Zophar, without mentioning Elihu. Besides, Job answers not a Word to this last, and by his Silence seems to approve of his Discourse*ⁱ. Grotius, who would be more consistent in his Character of *Elihu*, which yet his Acquittal, in God's Sentence, will not suffer any Commentator to be upon the received Idea of this Book, has run into a very strange Imagination. He supposes *Elihu* might be a Domestic, or Retainer, to one of *the three Friends*, and so be involved in the Condemnation of his Principal^k. — But to see the

^g Pour designer un homme qui ne se peut taire, un grand causeur. *Sur C. xxxii. v. 18.*

^h On ne peut nier qu'il n'y ait & de l'ignorance & de la presumption dans ce que dit Eliu, &, sur tout, une etrange prevention & une injustice visible dans la plupart des accusations qu'il forma contre Job. *Sur C. xxviii. v. 2.*

ⁱ Quoiqu' Eliu eût mal pris le sens des paroles de son ami, toutefois Dieu semble approuver au moins son intention ; puisque lorsqu'il declare aux amis de Job qu'ils ont mal parlé, & qu'il ordonne qu'on offre pour eux des holocaustes, il ne fait mention que de Bildad, d'Eliphaz, & de Sophar, sans parler d'Eliu. De plus Job ne repond point à ce dernier, & par son silence il semble approuver son discours.

^k Elihu hic non nominatur, ut nec supra ii. 11. fortè quod affecta esset alicujus trium. *In C. xlii. v. 7.*

Force

Force of Prejudice to inveterate Notions! It is visible to every one, who regards the two Speeches of *Elibu* and God with the least Attention, that the Arguments and Doctrine are the same. Yet *Calmet's* general Character of *Elibu* is, that there is a *vain Parade and Overflow of Words*; that there is a *Mixture of Ignorance and Presumption*, and a *visible Injustice*, in most of the *Accusations* he brings against Job. And yet of God's Speech he says, *Here we have A CLEAR SOLUTION of the Difficulties agitated between these five Friends*¹.

III. Having thus fixed^m the *Date* of the Book, our next Enquiry will be concerning its *AUTHOR*. That it was composed by an *inspired* Writer is beyond all Question. Not only its uncontroverted Reception and constant Place in the *Canon*, and its *internal* Marks of Divinity, which this Exposition has much *illustrated* and *enlarged*, but its being quoted as inspired Scripture by *St. Paul*ⁿ, will suffer no reasonable Man to doubt of it. By this Time therefore, I suppose, the Reader will be beforehand with me in judging it could scarce be any other than the great *EZRA* himself; who was a *ready Scribe in the Law of Moses*, and had *prepared his Heart to seek the Law of the Lord, and to do it, and to teach in Israel Statutes and Judgments*^o. For, he had the

¹ C'est ici le denouement de la piece, & la solution des difficultez qui avoient été agitées entre ces cinq amis.

^m To the Arguments already given, for fixing the Date of the Book of *Job* at this precise Time of the *Jewish Republic*, may be added the following: *Job* says, *He knoweth the Way that I take: When he hath TRIED me, I shall come forth as GOLD*. Chap. xxiii. v 10. Now we have shewn, in speaking of what *Maimonides* calls the *Chastisements of Love*, that they were unknown to the *Jewish Religion* till the Times of their later Prophets. See p. 440. But here the *Chastisements of Love* are expressly described.

ⁿ 1 COR. iii. 19.

^o EZRA vii. 6, 10.

Welfare of his People exceedingly at Heart, as appears from the Books of *Ezra* and *Nehemiah*: and this of *Job*, we have shewn, was written purposely for their Instruction. He made a correct Edition of the Scriptures, settled the Canon, and *added in several Places throughout the Books of his Edition what appeared necessary for the illustrating, connecting, or compleating of them*^p. He is reasonably supposed to be the Author of the *two Books of Chronicles* and the *Book of Esther*. It was a common Tradition too amongst the *Jews* that he was the same as *Malachi*. And his great Reputation as *a ready Scribe in the Law of Moses*, apparently gave Birth to that wretched Fable of the Destruction of the Scriptures in the *Babylonish* Captivity, and the Restoration of them by *Ezra* through divine Inspiration.

Thus is our Interpretation of the Book of *Job* so far from taking away any Dignity, or Authenticity it was before possessed of, that it establishes and enlarges both: The shewing it principally respected a whole People highly *ennobles* the Subject: And the fixing an anonymous Writing on one of the most eminent of God's Prophets greatly *strengthens* its Authority. But its chief Advantage, we presume, lies in this, that it renders one of the most difficult and obscure Books in the whole Canon of Scripture the most easy and intelligible, reconciles all the Characters to Nature, all the Arguments to Logic, and all the Doctrines and Positions to the Course and Order of God's Dispensations. Which, shewing it superior, in Excellence, to any human Composition, proves, what universal Tradition always taught, that it is truly Divine.

^p *Prideaux's Conn.* P. i. B. 5.

II.

Having brought down the Date of this Book so low, it is of little Importance to our Subject, whether the famous Passage in the *nineteenth Chapter* be understood of a *Resurrection from the Dead*, or only of *temporal Deliverance from Afflictions*. Yet as our Interpretation affords new Light towards ascertaining its Meaning, it will not be improper to say something to it.

I make no Scruple then to declare for the Opinion of those who understand the Words, [*I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter Day upon the Earth. And though after my Skin, Worms destroy this Body, yet in my Flesh shall I see God. Whom I shall see for myself, and mine Eyes shall behold, and not another^a,*] to signify Job's Confidence in a *temporal Deliverance from his Afflictions*: As all agree they may signify. And therefore I shall the less insist upon a common Observation, that our Translators, being in the other Opinion, gave a Force to their Expression which the Original will by no Means support. My Reasons are these,
 1. The understanding the Words of a *Resurrection* is repugnant to the whole Tenor of the Argument: and the other Sense exactly correspondent to it.
 2. The End and Design of the Composition, as explained above, absolutely requires this latter Sense, and disclaims the other.

I. We must observe that the Book of *Job* is strictly argumentative: and though it abounds with *poetic Figures*, and even *Descriptions*, they are such as closely relate to the Matter in Dispute. In this, much unlike the Writings of *David* and *Solomon*, which are full of single separate Sentences, each

^a Chap. xix. v 25, & seq.

compleat in itself and unrelated to any other. On this Account, the ablest of those who go into the other Sense have laboured to *reconcile* it to the *Context*. Thus much being granted, we argue against their Interpretation from these Considerations. 1. First the Disputants are all equally embarrassed to account for the Ways of Providence. *Job* contends that the good Man is sometimes unhappy: yet he appears to regard that Dispensation as a *new Thing* and *Matter of wonder*, *upright Men shall be astonished at this*^r — which our Interpretation well accounts for: The *three Friends*, that the good Man can never be unhappy, because such an Administration of Providence reflects upon God's Justice. Now the Doctrine of a *Resurrection* supposed to be urged by *Job*, cleared up all this Embarras. If therefore his Friends thought it true, it ended the Dispute: if they thought it false, it lay upon them to confute it. Yet they do neither: They neither call it into Question, nor allow it to be decisive. But, without the least Notice that any such Thing had been urged, they go on, as they begun, to inforce their former Arguments, and to confute that which they seem to understand was the only one *Job* urged against them, *viz.* The Consciousness of his own Innocence. But to be a little more particular. It fell to *Zophar's* Part to answer the Argument contained in the Words in Question, which I understand to be this — “Take, says *Job*, “this Proof of my Innocence, I believe “and confidently expect that God will visit me “again in Mercy, and restore me to my former “happy Condition.” To this *Zophar*, in Effect, replies, But why are you so miserable now? For he goes on, in the *twentieth Chapter*, to describe the Punishment of the Wicked to be just such a State

^r Chap. xvii. § 8.

as *Job* then laboured under. He does not directly say, *The Good are not miserable*; but that follows from the other Part of the Proposition, which he here inforces as a little more modest, *The Bad are never happy*. Now suppose *Job* spoke of the *Resurrection*, *Zophar* answered quite wide of the Purpose. 2. But what is still more unaccountable, *Job*, when he resumes the Dispute against his Friends, sticks to the Argument he *first* set out with; and, though he found it gave them little Satisfaction, repeats it again and again. But this other Argument of a *Resurrection*, so full of Piety and Conviction, which they had never replied to, he never once resumes; never upbraids his Adversaries for their Silence; nor triumphs, as he well might, in their Inability to answer it. But, if it was ever the Object of their Thoughts, it passes off like a *Dream* or *Reverie*, that neither Side paid any Attention to. In a word, the Dispute between *Job* and his Friends stood thus: They hold, that if God afflicted the good Man, it would be unjust, therefore the good Man not afflicted. *Job* holds, that God did afflict the good Man. But here Reason must submit, and own God's Ways to be inscrutable. Could he possibly rest in that Solution, how pious soever, if he had the more satisfactory one of a future State? To this let me add, that if *Job* spoke of a *Resurrection*, he not only contradicts the general Tenor of his Argument, which he maintains throughout the whole Disputation, but likewise what he says in many Places concerning the *irrecoverable Dissolution* of the Body^s. It is true,

^s See Chap. vii. v 9, 21. Chap. x. v 21. Chap. xvi. v 22. Chap. xiv. v 7, & seq. Could one who said, *For there is Hope of a Tree, if it be cut down, that it will sprout again, &c. But Man dieth, &c.* could such a one think of the Body like him who said, *But some Man will say, How are the Dead raised up, and with what Body do they come? Thou Fool, that which thou*

that even in the Sense of a temporal Deliverance he contradicts what he had said, in his Despair, in the *seventeenth* Chapter: But there is a manifest Difference between a Contradiction of *Opinion* and *Belief*, as in the first Case; and of *Passion* and *Affection* only, as in the latter. And for this latter he apologises, by desiring that this Confidence in his Deliverer might be engraved on a Rock as the Opinion he would stand to. 3. But, what is strangest of all, when the two Parties had quite confounded themselves, and one another, for Want, as one would think, of this Principle of a *Resurrection*, which so easily unravels all the Perplexities of the Dispute, the *fourth Friend*, the Moderator, steps in, as the *Precursor* of the Almighty, the great Decider of the Controversy. Here then we might reasonably think that the Honour of the Solution, which the Doctrine of the *Resurrection* affords, was reserved for *these*; but, to our great Surprise, they neither of them give the least Hint concerning it. — Those who contend for this Interpretation suppose the Notion to be here delivered in order to support its Truth. What Reason then can they give why neither the Moderator nor Decider should employ it to clear up Difficulties, when *Job* had touched upon it before? *Elihu* justifies God's Conduct; God bears Witness to *Job's* Innocence: Yet both concur in resolving all into Power omnipotent. This tends more to cloud than clear up the Obscurities of the Debate: Whereas the Doctrine of a *Resurrection* had rendered every Thing plain and easy. In a word, no *Solution* is given, though a *Decision* be made. All this is quite unaccountable to our Faculties of Understanding.

sowest is not quickned except it die. And that which thou sowest thou sowest not that Body that shall be, but bare Grain, it may chance of Wheat or of some other Grain, &c.

Let

Let us see next if the other Sense of the Words agree better with the Tenor of the Dispute. *Job*, now provoked, past Sufferance, at the Inhumanity and Malice of his pretended Friends, delivers himself up to Despair^t; and seems to contradict that Part of his Position which he had held till now^v, that God would at length bring the good Man out of Trouble. For which being reproved by *Bildad*, (*Shall the Earth be forsaken for thee? and shall the Rock be removed out of his Place^w? i. e. because it is your Pleasure so obstinately to maintain that God does not govern by equal Laws, shall it therefore be so? The Consequence of which would be a speedy Desolation; Shall the Rock^x or Providence of God be removed to humour your Passions?*) he recollects himself in the *nineteenth Chapter*, and comes again to his former Mind. He begins by complaining of their cruel Usage: Says, that if indeed he were in an Error, his Case was so deplorable that they ought rather to treat him with Indulgence: That this was no Season to use Severity: Begs they would have Pity on him; and then retracts what had fallen from him in the Anguish and Bitterness of his Soul: And lastly delivers this as his fixed Sentiment in which he was

^t Chap. xvii. ^v Chap. xiii. § 15, 16. — Chap. xiv. § 13. ^w Chap. xviii. § 4.

^x By the *Rock* I suppose is meant the *extraordinary Providence of God*; this being the commonest Name by which it went amongst the *Jewish People*. *He is the Rock, his Work is perfect: For all his Ways are Judgment*, DEUT. xxxii. 4. *The Rock of his Salvation*, § 15. — *Of the Rock that begat thee*, § 18. *Except their Rock had sold them*, § 30. *Their Rock is not as our Rock, even our Enemies themselves being Judges*, § 31. *Their Rock in whom they trusted*, § 37. *Neither is there any Rock like our God*, 1 SAM. ii. 2. *The Rock of Israel spake to me*, 2 SAM. xxiii. 3. *O Rock, thou hast established them*, HAB. i. 12. and a great Number of other Places.

determined to persevere ; (and in which he had indeed acquiesced, till made impatient and desperate by the Harshness of their Treatment) namely, that God would at length bring the good Man out of Trouble. *I know that my Redeemer liveth, &c.* Which he introduces thus: *Oh that my Words were now written, Oh that they were printed in a Book, that they were graven with an Iron Pen and Lead, in the Rock for ever y.* As much as to say, What I uttered through the Distemperature of my Passion, just before, I here retract, and desire may be forgotten, and that this may be understood as my fixed and unshaken Belief. And in this Sentiment, it is remarkable, he henceforward perseveres ; never relapsing again into the same Extravagance of Passion. Which Conduct agrees exactly with his general *Thesis*, that Providence is not equally administered ; for that the good Man is frequently unhappy, and the Wicked prosperous ; yet that at last God will bring the good Man out of Trouble, and punish the Wicked.

II. In the second Place, if we have given a right Interpretation of the Book of *Job*, a *temporal Deliverance*, and not the *Resurrection of the Body* must here be meant : For the Moral of the Dramatic Piece was to assure the *People*, represented under the Person of this venerable *Patriarch*, of those great temporal Blessings which the three Prophets, *Haggai*, *Zechariah*, and *Malachi* had predicted, in order to allay that Tumult of Mind that arose in every one on seeing the extraordinary Providence that protected their Forefathers, now about to leave them.

I cannot better conclude what has been here said, on this famous Passage, or better introduce what will be said on others, to come next under Exami-

nation, than with the judicious Remark of an ancient Catholic Bishop on this very Book: IT IS FIT WE SHOULD UNDERSTAND NAMES AGREEABLY TO THE NATURE OF THE SUBJECT MATTER; AND NOT REGULATE THE TRUTH OF THINGS ON THE ABUSIVE SIGNIFICATION OF WORDS^z.

III. But as the Terms, here made use of, appear to be *metaphorical*, and to allude to the Restoration of a dead Body to Life, some have ventured to infer, that those who use such Terms must needs have had the saving Knowledge of the *Resurrection of the Body*: And the following Observation has been repeated, by more than one Writer, with that Air of Complacency, which Men usually have for Arguments they think unanswerable — *If the Scriptures speak of temporal Misfortunes and Deliverance in Terms of Death and a Resurrection, then the Doctrine of a Resurrection must have been well known, or the Language would have been unintelligible. And here I will lay down this Rule, All Words that are used in a figurative Sense, must be first understood in a literal^a.*

This looks, at first Sight, like saying something; but is indeed an empty Fallacy; in which two very different Things are confounded with one another; namely, the *Idea* of a Resurrection, and the *Belief* of it. We shall shew therefore that the very contrary to the *first* Part of the Observation is true, and that the *latter* is nothing to the Purpose.

I. The Prophets of God frequently promise, in the most disastrous Times, a Restoration to the former Days of Felicity; and to obviate all Distrust

^z Πλὴν καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα προσήκει νοεῖν πρὸς τὴν ὑποκειμένην πραγμασίαν ποιότητα, καὶ ὁ πρὸς τὴν καλίσχοντι τῷ λέξεων τ' ἀληθῆ κανονίζειν. Sever. in Catena Græca in Job.

^a Dr. Felton's Two Sermons before the University of Oxford, p. 18, 19.

from unpromising Appearances, they put the Case at the very worst; and assure the People in metaphoric Expressions, that tho' the Community was as entirely dissolved as a dead Body reduced to Dust, yet God would raise that Community again to Life. Thus *Isaiab: Thy dead Men shall live, together with my dead Body shall they arise: Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the Dust: For thy Dew is as the Dew of Herbs, and the Earth shall cast out the Dead*^b. Nothing could be more obvious or simple than such a metaphoric Image, even amongst Men who had *no Knowledge* that the natural Body was indeed to rise again; because all Men knowing what it is to *live* and to *die*, all Men know what it is to *revive*, an Idea compounded of the other two: So that we see there was no Occasion for the *Belief* of the Resurrection of the Body *to make the Language intelligible*.

Nay farther, this metaphorical Expression must have there most Efficacy where the *religious Doctrine* of the Resurrection was unknown. For we have observed it was employed to inspire the highest Sentiments of God's Omnipotency; but that always strikes the Mind most forcibly that is as well *novel* as *superior* to its Comprehension. Therefore *Life from the Dead* was used proverbially, to express the most unexpected Deliverance, by the mightiest act of Omnipotence, and is common amongst the Prophets.

The following Instance will support both these Observations, and shew that the Doctrine was unknown, and the Metaphor of more Weight for its being so. The Prophet *Ezekiel*^c, when the State of Things was most desperate, is carried, by the Spirit, into a Valley full of dry Bones, and asked

^b Chap. xxvi. v 19.^c Chap. xxxvii.

this Question, *Son of Man, Can these dry Bones live?* A Question God would never have made to a Prophet brought up in the Knowledge and Belief of a Resurrection; tho' if at that Time it was known to any, it certainly was to *Ezekiel*. But admit the Question had been made to such an one, the Answer must needs have been, without Hesitation, in the Affirmative. But we find the Prophet altogether surprized at the Strangeness of the Demand. On the one hand, he was drawn by the apparent Impossibility of it to the natural Conception; on the other, by his Belief in the Omnipotence of God. Divided between these two Motives he makes the only Answer that a Man in such Circumstances could make, *O Lord God, thou knowest*^d. This surprising Act of Omnipotency is therefore represented; the Bones come together, are clothed with Flesh, and receive the *Breath of Life*^e. And then God declares the Meaning of the Vision: "Then he said
 "unto me, Son of Man, these Bones are the whole
 "House of *Israel*: Behold, they say, Our Bones are
 "dried, and our Hope is lost, we are cut off for
 "our Parts. Therefore prophesy and say unto them,
 "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my People,
 "I will open your Graves, and cause you to come
 "up out of your Graves, and bring you into the
 "Land of *Israel*. And ye shall know that I am the
 "Lord, when I have opened your Graves, O my
 "People, and brought you up out of your Graves,
 "and shall put my Spirit in you, and ye shall live;
 "and I shall place you in your own Land. Then
 "shall ye know that I the Lord have spoken it, and
 "performed it, saith the Lord^f."

Here we see, in a Prophecy delivered in Action or Vision instead of Words (the Nature and Origin-

^d y 3.^e y 8, 10.^f y 11, & seq.

nal of which has been discoursed of elsewhere) and afterwards explained by Words to ascertain its Meaning, that the figurative Ideas of *Death* and *Resurrection* are used for *temporal Distresses and Deliverance*. Where we find that the *Doctrines* of the Resurrection, from whence the Metaphor is supposed to arise, was so far from being well known, that the whole Force and Energy of the figurative Representation consists in its being altogether unknown; it alluding, without all Question, to that proverbial Speech amongst the *Jews*: *Wilt thou shew Wonders to the Dead? Shall the Dead arise and praise thee?* On the whole then, nothing was ever worse grounded than the Observation, that *if the Scriptures speak of temporal Misfortunes and Deliverance in the Terms of Death and a Resurrection, then the Doctrine of a Resurrection must have been well known, or the Language would have been unintelligible.*

And now for the general Rule that follows: *All Words that are used in a figurative Sense must be first understood in a literal.* If no more be meant than that every *figurative* Sense has a *literal*, the Proposition is true, but absurdly trifling; because *figurative* is a relative Term, and implies *literal* as its Correlative. If it means that he who uses Words in a *figurative* Sense must have an Idea of the *literal*, this is likewise true, but nothing to the Purpose; because the *Idea* of a Thing does not imply either the Truth or the *Belief* of it. But if it means, that a figurative Proposition implies the User's *Belief* of its literal Sense, this is to the Purpose, but not true. The Prophet had an Idea of dry Bones being clothed again with Flesh, and the Breath of Life inspired into the Carcase; but he was so far from believing that this was to be the Case of all Man-

kind, that he did not know whether it was possible that those Bones in the *Valley* could be so restored.

S E C T. III.

THE Book of *Job* has engaged us longer than I intended: But I shall make amends by dispatching the Remainder of the Objections with the utmost Brevity.

Those brought from the OLD Testament may be divided into two Parts:

I. Such as are supposed to prove the *separate* Existence, or, as it is called, the *Immortality* of the Soul.

II. — A *future State* of Reward and Punishment, or a *Resurrection*.

I. To support the first Point, the following Words of *Moses* are urged, — “And God said, “Let us make Man in *our Image*, after our *Likeness*: and let them have DOMINION, &c. — And “God created Man in *his own Image*, in the *Image of God* created he him^h:” From whence it is inferred, that Man was created with an *immaterial* Soul. But, I suppose, *Moses* here intimated quite another Matter. My Reasons are these: — I think it may be strictly demonstrated that Man has an *immaterial* Soul; but then the same Arguments which prove *that*, prove likewise that the Souls of all living Animals are *immaterial*; and this too without the least Injury to Religionⁱ. An *immaterial* Soul therefore being *common* to the whole animated Creation, and it being something *peculiar* to Man, in which the Image of God consists, I conclude the Historian did not here teach any thing concern-

^h GEN. i. 27.

ⁱ See Dr. Clarke against Mr. Collins on the Soul; and *The Enquiry into the Nature of the human Soul*.

ing an *immaterial Soul*. The only two Things *peculiar* to Man are his *Shape* and his *Reason*. None but an *Anthropomorphite* will say it was his *Shape*; I conclude therefore it was his *REASON*; which farther appears from hence, when God says, *Let us make Man in our Image, after our Likeness*, he immediately adds, *And let him have Dominion* over the whole Brute Creation. This plainly marks in what the Image or Likeness consisted: For what was it that could invest Man with this Dominion *de facto*, as well as *de jure*, but his Reason? It was certainly given too for some Preeminence; but this Preeminence consisted not in his having an immaterial Soul, for that is *common* to the whole Animal Creation: Now Reason is *peculiar* to Man; it consisted therefore in Reason. And thus much for the first Objection.

2. The next is from the following Words of the same Writer: — “And the Lord God formed Man of the Dust of the Ground, and breathed into his Nostrils the *Breath of Life*, and Man became a *living Soul*^k ;” that is, say the Objectors, had an *immortal Soul*. But this is only building on the Strength of an *English* Expression; every one knows that the Original signifies a *living Animal*; hence the same Writer speaks of a *dead Soul*^l, as well as *living Soul*. And indeed not only the Propriety of the Terms, but the very Sense of the Context requires us to confine the Meaning of *living Soul* to *living Animal*. God, the great *Plastic* Artist, is here represented as making and shaping out a Figure of Earth or Clay, which he afterwards animates or inspires with Life. He *breathed*, says the sacred Historian, into this Statue, *the Breath of Life*; and the Lump of Clay became a living Creature. But

^k GEN. ii. 7. ^l NUMB. vi. 6. See also LEV. xxi. 1, & 11.

St. Paul, I hope, may be believed whatever becomes of my Argument, who thus comments the very Text in Question: — *And so it is written, the first Man Adam was made A LIVING SOUL, the last Adam was made A QUICKENING SPIRIT^m.* Where we see the Apostle is so far from understanding any *Immortality* in this Account of the Creation, that he opposes the *mortal Animal Adam*, to the *immortal-making Spirit of CHRIST*.

3. The Phrase used by the sacred Historian to express the Deaths of the *Patriarchs* is, — *He died, and was gathered to his Peopleⁿ.* And dying is expressed by *going down into the Grave*, or into *Hell, SCHEOL*. — *I will go down into the Grave* (says *Jacob*) [or into *Hell*] *to my Son mourning^o*; which Phrases are supposed to intimate the Soul's surviving the Body, and retiring on the Dissolution of the Union, to one common Receptacle of Souls: For that it was not only said the Man *died and was buried*, but likewise that he *was gathered to his Fathers*: And *Jacob* said, he *would go down into the Grave to his Son*, who was supposed to have been devoured by wild Beasts. — But 1. The Objectors do not reflect on the Genius of the *Eastern Speech*, which gives Action and Motion to every thing; where, to be reduced to one common Lot or Condition is called being *gathered to their People*; in which Sense *Jacob* might properly say he would go down to the Grave to a dead Son, who was never buried, *i. e.* that he should find no Ease to his Sorrows till he was reduced to the same Condition. But the true Import of the Phrase is farther seen from the Word *gathered*, its being not only applied to their *People*, but to their *Grave*. Thus

^m 1 COR. xv. 45—49. ⁿ GEN. xxv. 8—17. Chap. xxxv. v 29. Chap. xlix. v 29 & 33. NUMB. xx. 24—26—28. Chap. xxvii. v 13. ^o GEN. xxxvii. 35.

GOD, by the Prophets to *Josiah*, — *I will gather thee unto thy Fathers, and thou shalt be GATHERED INTO THY GRAVE in Peace*^p. 2. The Objectors forget too the peculiar Genius of the *Hebrew Tongue*, which so much delights in Pleonasm; in which *to die*, and *to be gathered to their People*, are but two different Phrases for the same Thing. 3. The Truth of this Interpretation is confirmed by the Contexts, where all these Expressions occur; the Historian's Purpose being evidently nothing else than to record the Period of their Existence here on Earth.

These are all the Texts I can find objected, to support the teaching of the *Immortality of the Soul* by the *Law*, which have not been considered elsewhere. How little to the Purpose is now seen. But little or much, the Reader will remember they make nothing against my general Argument, for
 476. that I hold the early *Jews* did believe the Soul survived the Body. But the particular Reason I had to examine them has been given above.

II. We come now to those Scriptures which are urged to prove, that a *future State of Reward and Punishment*, or a *Resurrection*, was taught by the *Mosaic Law*. But before we proceed to the particular Texts, it will be proper to consider the *general* Argument brought from the Genius of the whole *Jewish Law*: which being entirely *TYPICAL*, or, as the Apostle says, *SPIRITUAL*, all the Promises and Denunciations of temporal Good and Evil, denoted and obumbrated a future State of Rewards and Punishments; for that it was a *Shadow of Things to come, but that the Body was of CHRIST*^q. If the Objectors mean by this, that the Sanction of temporal Rewards and Punishments was no more

^p 2 KINGS xxii. 20. ^q COLOSS. ii. 17.

than a mere Representation, in figurative Expressions, of the Doctrine of a Future State, without any real Meaning in the providential Disposition of the Things of this Life^r, then I think the whole Pretence to *Moses's* Divine Mission is irrecoverably given up; not to say that the *Pretence* would be as absurd as it was false. For a *Theocracy* (from whence flowed temporal Rewards and Punishments) was no figurative Expression, as appears from the real and substantial Laws made in Support of the Thing. In a word, 'tis a vile and impious Imagination, to be matched only by a like Madness in certain *Mahometan* Allegorists, who suppose, on the other hand, that Hell and Paradise in the *Alcoran* mean no more than the Pleasures and Afflictions of this

^r This wicked Fancy was originally *Jewish*, but some *Christian* Writers seem to have been far gone in it; particularly *Origen*; who, because *Celsus* had supposed, absurdly enough, that the Propagators of the Gospel had borrowed the Doctrine of a *Future State* from the Pagan Philosophers, was resolved not to be outdone, and therefore tells him, that where God says in the Book of *Moses*, which was older than all the Pagan Writings, *I am come down to deliver them out of the Hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that Land, unto a good Land and a large; unto a Land flowing with Milk and Honey; unto the Place of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites* [Exod. iii. 8.] he did not mean, as ignorant Men imagine, the Country of *Judea*, but the *Kingdom of Heaven*; for that how good a Land soever *Judea* might be, it was yet Part of that Earth which had been put under the Curse, and therefore, ὅς. — ἐχ' ὁρᾶν ὅτι Μωϋσῆς, ὁ πολλὰ καὶ τὰ Ἑλληνικῶν γραμμάτων ἀρχαιότερος, εἰσηγάγετ' Θεὸν ἐπαγγελλόμενον τὴν ἀγίαν γῆν, καὶ ἀγαθὴν καὶ πολλήν, ῥέουσαν γάλα καὶ μέλι, τοῖς κατὰ τὸν νόμον ἐαυτῶν βιώσασιν· ὅς' ὡς οἶονταί τινες τὴν ἀγαθὴν, τὴν κάτω νομιζομένην Ἰουδαίαν, κερδύνει καὶ αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇθεν κατήραμένη ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῆς ἀδικίας καὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας γῆ. *Cont. Cels.* p. 350. He that can rave at this rate must needs regard the whole Sanction of *temporal* Rewards and Punishments as a merely figurative Representation of *future*. But is not the hearkening to such Interpreters exposing Divine Revelation to the Contempt and Scorn of Infidels and Free-thinkers?

Life^s; so odly perverse is the Human Understanding when corrupted by the unclean Spirit of *Refinement*.

But if, by the Law's being TYPICAL OR SPIRITUAL, be only meant (as I think no sober Man will mean more) that the *temporal Rewards and Punishments really distributed to the Jews in the holy Land by an equal Providence, and the religious Ritual by which the Worship of God was there performed*, were Typical or significative of the Gospel Dispensation, and of the *Life and Immortality* which that brought to Light, I own it for a Truth: And, what is more, I require nothing farther to prove my Proposition, *That a future State of Rewards and Punishments was not taught to the Jewish People by their Law*. The Objectors suppose, as I do, that the *Jewish and Christian Religions* are two Parts of one entire Dispensation. St. Paul tells us the Order of these two Parts, THAT WAS NOT FIRST WHICH IS SPIRITUAL, BUT THAT WHICH IS NATURAL; AFTERWARDS THAT WHICH IS SPIRITUAL^t. Yet, at the same Time, he tells us that THE LAW IS SPIRITUAL^v. How is this to be reconciled? No otherwise than thus, *That the Law was typical of the future spiritual Part of the entire Dispensation*. — Again, the Objectors pretend the Reason why *Moses did not* PLAINLY teach a *Future State*, in the Manner CHRIST did, was because the *Jews* were a *carnal People*, incapable of *spiritual Things*. Now what is the Consequence of this, but that the *spiritual Sense* was reserved for better

^s Il y a parmi les sectateurs d'Ali, une secte qui prend son nom d'un Docteur nommé Alkhatthab, lequel a enseigné que les delices du Paradis, & les peines de l'Enfer ne sont autre chose que les plaisirs & les afflictions de la vie. *Herbelot. Bib. Orientale, Mot AKHRAT & AKHRET.*

^t 1 COR. XV. 46.

^v ROM. vii. 14.

Times, when their Minds should grow more pure and defecated.—But farther, the Objectors own that *temporal* Good and Evil were not only proposed, but *actually dispensed* to the *Jews*, living for some Time under an equal Providence. And what was the Consequence of this but to confine them to the *literal* Sense of their *Sanction*, and stop them from looking farther? Yet contrary to Reason, to Scripture, to the Order of Things, nay even to their own Systems, they will suppose, because the Law is said to be *spiritual*, or to have a spiritual Sense, that therefore this Sense always went along with, and was inseparably attached to, the *literal*, in the Understandings of the *Jewish* People. Which is so strangely absurd, that it takes away the very Ground and Reason of *two Senses*. For why, let me ask, had the Law a *spiritual* Sense, under a *carnal* Cover, but for *this*, that the first *Jews* were so grossly minded as to be incapable of *spiritual* Things; and were therefore, in order to govern their Affections, presented with *carnal* to rest upon? That *Schoolmaster*, as St. Paul calls the Law, which was to bring them by Degrees, through the Elements of *Carnality*, to the *spiritual* Things of CHRIST.—See, for all this, the Scheme of our Objectors. The early *Jews* are supposed so grossly minded as to be incapable of tasting spiritual Delights, and therefore they had a carnal Cover laid before them: Yet were they, at the same Time, of so penetrating Apprehensions, that they pierced through this thick carnal Cover to which they were attached, into the spiritual Substance, for which they had no Relish.

1. But to proceed to the particular Texts urged in Support of this Opinion. God says to *Abraham*, *I am thy exceeding great Reward*^w. And again: “—I will establish my Covenant between me and

^w GEN. XV. 1.

“ thee,

“ thee, and thy Seed after thee, in their Genera-
 “ tions, for an *everlasting Covenant*; to be a God
 “ *unto thee* and to thy Seed after thee. And I will
 “ give unto thee, and to thy Seed after thee, the
 “ Land wherein thou art a Stranger, all the Land of
 “ *Canaan*, for an everlasting Possession; and I will be
 “ their God *.” And repeats the same Promise to
Isaac and to *Jacob* personally; and yet gave *Abra-*
ham no Inheritance in the Land, though he pro-
 mised he would give it to HIM and to his Seed after
 him. — Thus have these Texts been urged by an
 excellent Writer ^y against the *Sadducean* Opinion,
 as proving they contain a Promise of future Rewards
 in another Life: But urged by him, I will suppose,
 as proving it in a *secondary* or *spiritual* Sense only.
 Because that Sense is sufficient for his Argument:
 and because in that Sense only is it true. 1. For
 first the Promise of giving the Land of *Canaan* to
Abraham and his Posterity was *literally* fulfilled, tho’
Abraham was never personally put into Possession of
 it. For the Land was promised to one Family:
 and *Abraham* and his Posterity are collectively con-
 sidered as composing that Family. For sure God
 may be allowed to explain his own Promise. Now
 though he tells *Abraham* he would give *him* the
 Land, yet, at the same Time, he assures him that
 it would be many hundred Years before his Poste-
 rity should be put into Possession of it. For when
Abraham desired to know whereby he might be cer-
 tain that he should inherit the Land of *Canaan*^z,
 he is ordered to offer a Sacrifice; after which,
 God, in a Vision, explains to him the Import of
 his Promise: That *his Seed should be a Stranger in*
a Land that was not theirs, and should serve them,
and that they should afflict them four hundred Years;

* GEN. xvii. 7, 8. y Dr. S. Clarke’s *Evidence of Nat.*
and Rev. Religion, p. 241. Ed. 6. z GEN. xv. 8.

that

that afterwards they should come out with great Substance, and in the fourth Generation should come into Canaan, for that the Iniquity of the Amorites was not yet full^a. And that, as concerning himself, he should go to his Fathers in Peace, and should be buried in a good old Age^b. Thus we see, that both what God meant by the Promise of giving to *Abraham* and to his Posterity, and what *Abraham* understood he meant, was, that his Posterity, after a certain Time, should be put in Possession of the Land. And lest any Mistake should remain concerning the Accomplishment of this Promise, the sacred Historian sums up the Relation in these concluding Words: *In that same Day the Lord made a Covenant with Abram, saying, UNTO THY SEED HAVE I GIVEN this Land*^c. But had the Historian omitted so exact an Explanation of the Promise, yet common Sense would instruct us how to interpret it. A whole Country is given to *Abraham* and to his Seed. Could it possibly be God's Design, who does nothing in vain, to put this Family in Possession of the Land of *Canaan*, till they were numerous enough to occupy and defend it? But of this I have spoken elsewhere^d. Not to mention, that where a Grant of any thing is made to a Body of Men collectively, no Laws of Compact ever understood the Performance to consist in putting every Individual of that Body into Possession. 2. Secondly, the giving an heavenly *Canaan* to *Abraham* in Person could not be the *literal* Sense of the Text, because an *earthly Canaan* is owned to be the *immediate* Subject of the Promise. The *Jews* indeed contend for this *literal* Sense, but with some Shew of Reason. For they hold, the future State at the Resurrection is to be passed in the earthly Land of

^a GEN. XV. 13, & seq. ^b v. 15. ^c v. 18. ^d See p. 342.

Canaan, where *Abraham*, they say, will then rise and take Possession^e. This however is consistent. But my *Christian* Objectors, who hold no such Opinion, must be content at last to find a future State only in the *spiritual* Sense of these Words; and that Sense we are very willing to allow them.

2. “The Days of the Years of my *Pilgrimage*, “says *Jacob* to *Pharaoh*, are an hundred and thirty “Years: few and evil have the Days of the Years “of my Life been, and have not attained unto the “Days of the Years of the Life of my Fathers in “the Days of their *Pilgrimage*^f.” — From this Speech it is concluded, that *Moses* taught a future State: And, especially, as the Author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* has brought^g it for a Proof, that *Jacob* and the Patriarchs looked for a *better Country*. That *Jacob* did so, is unquestionable; but that these Words, in their literal and most obvious Meaning, express any such Thing, can never be allowed. *Pharaoh* is here questioning the *Patriarch*, not about *human Life in general*, but his *own*. Therefore, to make the Reply pertinent, *Jacob* must be understood as meaning, by *his Pilgrimage*, the unsettled Way of Life amongst his Family, living in Tents, and removing from Place to Place, as the Conveniences of Pasturage afforded Invitation. And, by the *Evil of his Days*, the Straits he suffered from the Fraud of *Laban*, and the Hatred of his Brother *Esau*. As for the Complaint

^e Deus Abrahamo loquens ait: Dabo tibi, & semini tuo post te, terram peregrinationis tuæ. Atqui constat, Abrahamum, & reliquos Patriarchas eam terram non possedisse: necesse ergo est, ut resuscitentur, quo bonis promissis fruantur; alioqui promissa Dei irrita & falsa forent. Hinc itaque non tantum animæ immortalitas probatur, sed etiam *essentiale fundamentum legis*, Resurrectio scilicet mortuorum. *Menasseh Ben-Israel de Resurrectione Mort.* p. 7.

^f GEN. xlvii. 9.

^g Chap. xi. y 13.

of the *Fewness of his Days*, he himself explains it to be, not on account of the Shortness of human Life in general, but, because he *had not attained unto the Days of the Years of the Life of his Fathers*. The Sense therefore, which the sacred Writer puts on these Words, is the *spiritual Sense*.

3. The same Patriarch, in the last Benediction of his Sons, breaks in upon the prophetic Blessings with this pious Ejaculation, *I have waited for thy Salvation, O Lord*^h. Which is supposed to respect the Salvation of Mankind by JESUS CHRIST. I grant it does so in a *spiritual* Sense; nay, for ought I know, it may in a *literal*. But how should an early *Jewish* Reader understand it in *this Sense*, when the same Terms of the *Salvation* of God, or of the Lord, are perpetually employed, throughout the whole Bible, to signify God's temporal Mercies to the *Jewish* People; and when now, that the Mystery of the Gospel has been so long revealed, *Christian* Commentators understand it in an hundred *different Senses*?

4. Balaam, under the Influence of the Holy Spirit, says: *Let me die the Death of the Righteous, and let my last End be like his*ⁱ: Which is understood as a Wish that he might be Partaker with the Righteous in *another Life*. Had the apostate Prophet said, *Let me live the Life of the Righteous*, it would have had a much fairer Claim for such a Meaning. As it is, both the Force of the Words, and their Relation to the Context, restrain us to this literal Meaning, *Let me die in a mature old Age, after a Life of Health and Peace, with all my Posterity flourishing about me*: Which was the promised Reward of the *righteous* Observers of the *Law*. But if any

^h GEN. xlix. 18.ⁱ NUMB. xxiii. 10.

one will say it has, besides, a sublimer Meaning, I have no Reason to contend with him.

5. The *Psalmist*, in a holy Confidence of God's Mercies, says: *Thou wilt not leave my Soul in Hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see Corruption. Thou wilt shew me the Path of Life; in thy Presence is Fulness of Joy, at thy right Hand there are Pleasures for evermore*^k. — The Scope of the whole *Psalm* is to implore the Protection of God, from this Consideration, that the *Psalmist* not only stedfastly adheres himself to the Law of God, but is ready to lend his Aid and Support to all those who do. — That the Vengeance of God pursues Idolatry, which he carefully avoids — That the God of *Israel* is his *Portion*, and the Land of *Canaan* a fair *Inheritance* — That this steadfast Adherence to the Lord is his Confidence and Peace — Then follow the Words in Question, — That he is sure, *God will not leave his Soul in Hell, &c.* that is, suffer him to fall *immaturely*, as was the certain Lot of the Transgressors of the *Law*. — And concludes, that walking in the Law of God is the highest Pleasure, as well as Security. All which is expressed in Terms so magnificent, as shews this *Psalm* to have a *spiritual* as well as *literal* Meaning.

6. Again, — *As for me, I will behold thy Face in Righteousness: I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy Likeness*^l. These Words, the best Interpreters agree, do signify his morning Adorations before the Ark, the symbolic Residence of the divine Presence^m.

^k PSAL. xvi. 10, 11.

^l PSAL. xvii. 15.

^m Videtur significare David arcam, quam singulis temporibus matutinis Deum adoraturus adibat. *Cleric. in locum.* — Pro more Hebr. Poeseos, ipsum in Sanctuario quotidie in praesentia Dei ad arcam, quod divinae praesentiae symbolum erat, sese velle sistere, quod illi ante omnia in votis fuit, summoque gaudio perfudit. *Hare in loc.*

7. And

7. And again: *Surely Goodness and Mercy shall follow me all the Days of my Life, and I will dwell in the House of the Lord for everⁿ.* By the *House of the Lord* can be meant nothing else but the *Tabernacle* or the *Temple*: So that, *for ever*, or as the *Heb.* says, *to Length of Days*, must mean that mature old Age, which the Law promised to its faithful Followers.

8. In the xxxvi *Psalms*, the sacred Writer says: *For with thee is the Fountain of Life: in thy Light shall we see Light^o.* Here, to prove the *Immortality* of Man, a Text is produced, which teaches the *Eternity* of God. But I know some, who think there is a necessary Connection between these two Truths.

9. “Like Sheep (says the *Psalmist*) they [the “Wicked] are laid in the Grave, Death shall feed “upon them; and the Upright shall have Domi- “nion over them in the Morning, and their Beauty “shall consume in the Grave, from their Dwelling. “But God will redeem my Soul from the Power “of the Grave, for he shall receive me^p.” The literal Meaning of which is, as appears by the Context, that the Wicked should be untimely cut off and destroyed, *in the Morning*, that is, by the Judgment of the Law, which was administered in the Morning Hours^q; but that his Life, and the Life of the Upright, should be preserved and prolonged. But here, once for all, let me desire the Objectors to observe what it is that is ever opposed, in the many Passages of this Sort, to *Life, Redemption, &c.* ’Tis not *Misery, Torments, &c.* as it must have been,

ⁿ Ps. xxiii. 6.

^o Ps. xxxvi. 9.

^p Ps. xlix. 14, 15.

^q See JEREM. xxi. 12. “O House of *David*, thus saith the “Lord, *Execute Judgment IN THE MORNING*, and deliver “him that is spoiled, out of the Hand of the Oppressor, lest “my Fury go out like Fire, — because of the Evil of your “Doings.”

did *Life literally* signify eternal Life in a future State; but *Death*, which shews it was a Life here on Earth.

10. *Thou shalt guide me* (says he again) *with thy Counsel, and afterwards receive me to Glory*^r. Or, as an excellent Critic has it, *Consilio tuo deduxisti me, & postea cum gloria excepisti me*. Thou wast, or shalt be, always present with me in Difficulties and Distresses; and shalt lead and conduct me to better Fortunes. This *literal* Sense the Context again requires.

11. “But the Mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear him, and his Righteousness unto Childrens Children; to such as keep his Covenant, and to those that remember his Commandments to do them^s.” This is so far from intimating a *future State*, that it is the very temporal Promise annexed to the *second Commandment* — *Shewing Mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my Commandments*^t.

12. — *For there the Lord commanded the Blessing, even Life for evermore*^v. — *There*, Where? In the *Habitation of Brethren living together in Unity*. Nothing else then can be meant, but that Death and Dangers should not approach a House so strongly united within itself.

13. In the Book of *Proverbs* it is said — “The Wicked is driven away in his Wickedness: BUT THE RIGHTEOUS HATH HOPE IN HIS DEATH^w.” That is, the Righteous hath Hope that he shall be delivered from the most imminent Dangers. See Ps. xxxiii. 19. lvi. 13.

14. And again — *The Way of Life is above to the Wise, that he may depart from Hell beneath*^x.

^r Ps. lxxiii. 24.

^s Ps. ciii. 17, 18.

^t EXOD. xx. 6.

^v Ps. cxxxiii. 3.

^w PROV. xiv. 32.

^x Chap. xv. § 24.

That

That is, the wise Man prolongs his Days here on Earth, and escapes that untimely Death which attends Vice and Folly. A Doctrine perpetually inculcated throughout this Book, as at *Chap. x. § 2, 28. Chap. xi. § 7. Chap. xii. § 28. Chap. xxi. § 16.*

15. We conclude with the *Preacher*, who says, that *Wisdom giveth Life to them that have it*: And so says the Law of *Moses* (which is here alluded to) and yet means *this Life*.

16. Again: “ Though a Sinner do Evil an hundred Times, and his Days be prolonged, yet surely I know that it shall be well with them that fear God.” What is meant by this, the very following Words declare: *But it shall not be well with the Wicked, neither shall he prolong his Days, which are as a Shadow; because he feareth not before God*^z. — That is, though the Wicked be suffered to go on for some Time, yet for all that, Vengeance shall overtake and arrest him in the Middle of his Course.

17. And again — “ Rejoice, O young Man, in thy Youth, and let thy Heart cheer thee in the Days of thy Youth, and walk in the Ways of thy Heart, and in the Sight of thine Eyes: but know thou that, for all these Things, God will bring thee into Judgment. Therefore remove Sorrow from thy Heart, and put away Evil from thy Flesh, for Childhood and Youth are Vanity^a.” That is, in giving an innocent and lawful Indulgence to thy Youth, take heed lest thou transgress the Bounds of Virtue and Piety. For know, that God will certainly punish thy Offences, either in thy own Person, or in thy Posterity.

^y Eccl. vii. 12.
^y 9, & seq.

^z Chap. viii. § 12.

^a Chap. xi.

These are all the Passages of Moment (till we come to the Prophets) that I could ever hear of, objected to the Opinion, *That a future State of Reward and Punishment is not in the Mosaic Dispensation*. By which it appears, that the Objectors have been very inattentive to the three following Considerations, which ought never to have been absent from the Thoughts of an Interpreter of the Old Testament; 1. The *Context*. 2. The Genius of the *Eastern Style*. 3. The Oeconomy under which the early *Jews* lived, namely of an *extraordinary Providence*. But this last is a Fault, though the most material of all, yet common to them and the late *Jewish* Writers; who considering only the Dispensation under which *themselves* lived, thought it harsh and unnatural to interpret such Passages of the *present* Distribution of Things.

On the whole, therefore, it appears, that all these Passages, in their *obvious primary* Sense, relate to the *Things of this Life*; but that some of them are expressed by the Holy Spirit in such a manner, as makes it *now* most evident, that they have likewise a higher and sublimer Meaning, and do indeed refer to the Completion of the *Law* by the *Gospel*^b.

^b The Texts here examined are urged in common both by *Jews* and *Christians*; but, besides these, the *Jews* have a Set peculiar to themselves, which the *Christians* have never yet ventured upon. For the Reader's Curiosity, as they are most of them of the Nature of Riddles, I shall mark out what they bring from the *Pentateuch* to prove the *Immortality* of the Soul, and the *Resurrection* of the Body, as they are collected by the learned *Menasseh Ben-Israel* in his Tract *De Resurrectione Mortuorum*. — For the *Immortality*, EXOD. xix. 6. — Chap. xxxiii. § 20. LEVIT. vii. 25. DEUT. xiv. 1, 2. — Chap. xxii. § 7. — Chap. xxxii. § 47. — For the *Resurrection*, GEN. iii. 19. — Chap. xxxvii. § 10. EXOD. xv. 6. LEVIT. xxv. NUMB. xv. 30. — Chap. xviii. § 28. DEUT. iv. 4. — Chap. xxxii. § 39. — Chap. xxxiii. § 6.

S E C T. IV.

WE come at length to the Texts of the NEW TESTAMENT, which are urged to prove, against itself, that *Life and Immortality was brought to Light* by the OLD.

I. The first is that famous Argument of JESUS against the Sadducees: — JESUS answered and said unto them, *Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the Power of God. — But as touching the Resurrection of the Dead, Have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the Dead, but of the Living^c.* — There is not, throughout the whole Bible, a plain Text (as this is) so strangely mistaken and perverted.

I. First, The Case of *Abraham, &c.* is generally understood to be used by our Blessed Lord, as a direct Proof^d of the *Resurrection of the dead Body*, in the Manner St. Paul urges the Case of JESUS himself: *But now is CHRIST risen from the Dead, and become the first Fruits of them that slept^e*; than which nothing can be more irrational or absurd; the Bodies of *Abraham* and the Patriarchs being yet in Dust, and reduced to their primitive Earth. What hath deceived Men in this

^c MATT. xxii. 29—32.

^d So Mr. Le Clerc in his *Defense des Sentimens sur l'Histoire Critique*. — Nôtre Seigneur presse ces termes, en sorte qu'il suppose qu'il ne faut qu'entendre la langue dans laquelle l'Ecriture parle pour reconnoître la Resurrection, MATT. xxii. 31. — Il ne faut que lire ce raisonnement de Jesus Christ, pour sentir qu'il est tiré de cette expression, *être le Dieu de quelqu'un*, que l'on ne pourroit appliquer à Dieu, si celui, dont on dit qu'il est le Dieu, étoit mort sans devoir jamais resusciter. p. 102, 103.

^e 1 COR. xv. 20.

Matter, is the Introduction to the Argument, — *But as touching the Resurrection of the Dead,* — which they supposed an Exordium to a direct Proof; whereas the Proof that follows, is only *indirect*, namely, an Argument for *the separate Existence of the Soul*; yet *directly* to the Purpose. The Case stood thus: He is here arguing against the *Sadducees*. Now these supported their Opinion, of *no Resurrection of the Body*, on this Principle, that *the Soul had no separate Existence*, but died at the Dissolution of the Union; which Principle once overthrown, they had nothing left to oppose to the Writings of the Prophets, or the Preaching of JESUS. Against it therefore our Blessed Lord thus divinely argues:—
 “But as concerning the Resurrection of the Dead,
 “you ground your Denial of it on this Principle,
 “that the Soul dies with the Body; but you err as
 “much in not knowing the Scriptures, as in not
 “rightly conceiving of the Power of God. For
 “the Words of *Moses* himself, which you allow to
 “be a good Authority, prove the Soul dies not
 “with the Body, but has a separate Existence.
 “Now he tells us, that God, long after the Death
 “of *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*, called himself
 “their God: But God is not the God of the Dead,
 “but of the Living; therefore the Souls of those
 “Patriarchs are yet existing in a separate State.”—
 This is the Force of the Argument.

2. The second Mistake is, that JESUS, by these Words, insinuates, that *Moses* CULTIVATED the Doctrine of a *Resurrection*, or a *Future State*. But here again the Objectors seem to forget, against whom the Argument is addressed, the *Sadducees*. Now these not only held that *Moses* did *not teach*, but that he did NOT BELIEVE that Doctrine. This was the Error JESUS aimed at in his Confutation, and only *this*; because the Opinion that *Moses* did
 not

not *teach* or *cultivate* it, was no Error at all, as appears, amongst many other Reasons, from hence: The *Jews* might *reasonably* understand the Title of *God of Abraham, &c.* to mean the peculiar tutelary God of his Family; for that the Terms *Jacob* and *Israel* are frequently used in Scripture for the whole Nation of the *Jews*; *Aaron* for the whole Order of the Priesthood; *Dan, Judah, &c.* for the whole Body of each Tribe: And as they in Reason might understand it thus, so we find, by the History of the early *Jews*, that they in Fact *did*.

The Sum then of the Objection amounts to this, that from JESUS's Argument it appears, that the separate Existence of the Soul might be fairly inferred from the Writings of *Moses*; which Inference I not only grant, but have proved too, that the early *Jews* did make, tho' not from these Words, for the Reason given above. Besides, these Objectors do not consider, that this has all the Marks of a *new* Argument, *unknown* to the *Pharisees*; and indeed both the *Dignity* of our Lord's Character, and the *Impression* he would make on his Opposers, seemed to require it. Accordingly we find them struck dumb; and *the Multitude that heard this, astonished at his Doctrine*^f. But would either have been so affected with an *old* Argument, long hacknied in the Schools or Synagogues of the *Pharisees*? I am not ignorant, that the modern Rabbins employ this Argument very familiarly for a Resurrection; but they borrowed it from the *Gospel*, as they have done many other Things; the Reason of which Rabbinical Commentators not apprehending, have supposed the *borrowing* to be all on the other Side: but more of this Matter in its Place. — And thus much for this celebrated Text; which, I hope, for

^f MATT. xxii. 33.

the future we shall hear no more of, in Way of Opposition.

II. The next Objection is borrowed from the *Parable* of the *rich Man and Lazarus*; where the former, being in Hell, desires *Abraham*, whom he saw far off in Paradise, to send *Lazarus* to his Father's House, to testify to them, and to lead them to Repentance, lest they too should come into that Place of Torments. To which *Abraham* replies: *If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the Dead.* Hence it is concluded, that both *Moses* and the *Prophets* taught a future State of Rewards and Punishments. But the Objectors are quite wide of the Matter, — As, in the former Case, they would not see the Argument was directed against the *Sadducees*; so here, by as perverse a *Connivance*, they won't reflect, that the Parable is addressed to the *Pharisees*. It is agreed, we must judge of the Drift and End of a Discourse (especially a Discourse coming from the supreme Reason of all Things) from the Character of those to whom it is addressed. Now had this Parable been told to the *Sadducees*, whose grand Error it was, that there is *no future State* of Rewards and Punishments; and had the *rich Man* been represented as a *Sadducee*, who was too late convinced of his Error, and wanted to undeceive his Father's House, which his evil Doctrines had misled; had this, I say, been the Case, there might have been some Ground for the Inference the Objectors draw, which I suppose is this, That it *as plainly appears from Moses and the Prophets, that there is a future State of Rewards and Punishments, as if one came back from that State to tell us so.* On the contrary, the Parable was particularly addressed to the *Pharisees*, the great Patrons of a future State,

and who sedulously inculcated it in Opposition to the Sadducees. It is introduced in this manner: *And the Pharisees also, who were COVETOUS* [φιλάργυροι] *heard all these things: and they derided him^h. For which they are thus reprov'd: Ye are they which justify yourselves before Men: but God knoweth your Heartsⁱ. And then presently follows the Parable. Their grand Error therefore was an Error of Practice, Avarice and Luxury. To reform which, a rich Pharisee is represented, as living in all kind of Delicacy, without any Compassion for the Poor, and dying impenitent. When coming, in the other World, into a Place of Punishment, he wants one to be sent to his Brethren, who *believed*, as he did, the Doctrine of a future State, to assure them, that Luxury and Inhumanity, unrepented of, would certainly damn them. Which Information he thought would be best enforced by a Miracle: *If one went unto them from the Dead, they will repent^k. Where observe, it is not, — they will believe. To this common Mistake Abraham's Reply is admirably pertinent: If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the Dead: i. e. "If they will not hear*
" Moses, and the Prophets, whose Authority they
" acknowledge, and whose Missions were confirmed
" by so many and well attested Miracles, neither
" will they regard a new one of the Resurrection of
" a dead Man. Now Moses and the Prophets have
" denounced the most severe Threatnings, on the
" Part of God, against Vice and Impenitence."
 This is the Force of the Argument, in which we see the Question of a *future State* is no more concerned, than thus far only, that God will punish, either here or hereafter. *Moses and the Prophets**

^h ψ 14. ⁱ ψ 15. ^k ψ 30.

threatened the Punishment *here*; and, while here it was executed, the *Jews* looked no farther: But when the *extraordinary* Providence, by which that Punishment was administered, ceased, the *Jews* began, from those very Promises and Denunciations, to entertain reasonable Hopes of an Hereafter, where all Inequalities should be set even, and God's Threats and Promises executed to the full. So that all that Logic or Criticism will authorize the *Believers* of a future State to draw from this Parable is this momentous Truth, that God is a *severe Punisher of Luxury and Inhumanity unrepented of*.

But now admit the mistaken Interpretation of the Objectors; and what follows — *That Moses and the Prophets taught a future State*. But my Proposition is, that *Moses did not*. Therefore I might well allow, that, when the Prophets are joined with him, and have explained the spiritual Meaning of his Law, and disenvveloped his Sense, they both together did teach it, and yet not recede one Tittle from my Proposition. But I am ashamed of a Task that will afford me no better Objections to dispute upon, than such as these.

III. In what follows, I hardly think our Objectors can be serious, as well apprized as I am of the Gravity of their Natures. — *Search the Scriptures* (says JESUS to the *Jews*) *for in them YE THINK YE HAVE eternal Life, and they are they which testify of me. And ye will not come to me that ye MIGHT HAVE LIFE*¹. The homicide^m *Jews*, to whom these Words are addressed, *thought they had eternal Life in their Scriptures; THEREFORE they had eternal Life*. If I allow this, they must allow me to add another, *THEREFORE the Mission of JESUS was intirely vain; as being superseded by that of Mo-*

¹ JOHN v. 39, 40. ^m y 16.

ses. This is a necessary Consequence, and gives us, to be sure, a very high Idea of the Reasoning of the Blessed JESUS.

By the same Art of Inferring, I suppose too they will conclude, that, when St. Paul says to the unbelieving Jew: *And thou art confident that thou thyself art a Guide of the Blind, a Light of them which are in Darkness, an Instructor of the Foolish, a Teacher of Babes, which hast the Form of Knowledge and of the Truth in the Lawⁿ*; they will conclude, I say, that therefore it was the Jew, and not St. Paul, that was *the Guide of the Blind, a Light of them which are in Darkness, and that had the Form of Knowledge and of the Truth in the Law*.

In earnest, all that this Scripture teaches us is, that the Jews THOUGHT they had eternal Life by the Mosaic Dispensation. For which, if our Lord's Word won't pass alone, we have the concurrent Testimony of his Apostles; who wrote large Portions of their *Epistles* to prove not only that they thought so, but that they were greatly mistaken in so thinking. St. Paul says, *the Promise came not by the Law^o*. For that if Righteousness came by the Law, then was CHRIST dead in vain^p — If the Inheritance were of the Law, it was no more of Promise^q. If there had been a Law given, which could have given Life, verily Righteousness should have been by the Law^r.

But supposing the Words, *ye think ye have eternal Life, ὑμεῖς δοκεῖτε*, considered separately, did not imply, that these were *their Thoughts only*, yet being opposed to the following Words: *Ye will not come to me that ye MIGHT HAVE LIFE, ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχητε*, they shew, that whoever thought so besides, it was

ⁿ ROM. ii. 19.

^o ROM. iv. 13.

^p GAL. ii. 21.

^q Chap. iii. v. 18.

^r GAL. iii. 21.

not JESUS, whose Argument stands thus — “ The
 “ Scriptures, I affirm, and am ready to prove,
 “ testify of me. What Reason then have you to
 “ disown my Character? It cannot surely be, be-
 “ cause I preach up a *new* Doctrine of Life and
 “ Immortality. For you yourselves own the Truth
 “ of it: and what is more, interpret several Passa-
 “ ges in your own Scriptures, to signify *eternal*
 “ *Life*; which I own, in their *spiritual* Sense, do
 “ so. Now that Life, which you think you HAVE
 “ by your Scriptures, but HAVE NOT, do I here offer
 “ unto you, THAT YE MIGHT indeed HAVE
 “ LIFE.”

II.

We are now got to the very *Palladium* of the Cause, the famous *eleventh Chapter to the Hebrews*: Where it is said, that by FAITH, Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, &c. performed all their acceptable Works to God. — That they looked for an heavenly City. — That they saw the Promises afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and desired an heavenly Country — That they all died in Faith. That Moses esteemed the Reproach of CHRIST greater Riches than the Treasures of Egypt. — That by Faith the Jewish Leaders did all their great and marvelous Works. — That their very Women despised Death, in Hopes to obtain a Part in the Resurrection of the Just — And that all these obtained a good Report THROUGH FAITH — This, they say, plainly shews, that a future State of Rewards and Punishments, or more properly, the *Christian Doctrine of Life and Immortality*, was taught by the Law. — To which I answer,

1. That if so, the *eleventh Chapter* directly contradicts all the *rest* of the *Epistle*. In which, as we have shewn, there are more exprefs Declarations, that

that Life and Immortality was not known or taught by the Law, than in all the other Books of the New Testament. But is it possible, that a Writer, who had said, that *the Law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better Hope did*; — That CHRIST *hath obtained a more excellent Ministry than Moses, by how much also he is the Mediator of a better Covenant, which is established upon better Promises*; — That *the Law was only a Shadow of good Things to come, and not the very Image*; is it possible, I say, that such a Writer should forget himself before he came to the End of his Epistle, and, in Contradiction to all this, affirm that *Life and Immortality was known and taught under the Law*? We may venture to say then, that this *eleventh Chapter* must have a very different Meaning. Let us see if we can find it out: and sure it requires no great Search.

2. The Argument of the whole *Epistle to the Hebrews* is against *Jews* and *Judaizing Christians*. The Point in Difference was this: The Gospel taught JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH: The *Judaizers* thought it must needs be by WORKS. One Consequence of which, in their Opinion, was, that the Law of *Moses* was still in force. They had no more Conception than our modern *Socinians* and *Freethinkers*, that there could be any Merit in *Belief*, where the Understanding was unavoidably determined by Evidence. The Reader sees then, that the Dispute was not whether *Faith in Moses* or *Faith in Jesus* made Men acceptable to God; but whether *Works* or the *Act of Believing*; consequently, where the Apostle shews it was *Faith* or the *Act of Believing*, he must mean *Faith in the Abstract*, not *Faith in Jesus*. For the *Jews*, even that Part of them which embraced JESUS as the *Messiah*, denied it to be any kind of *Faith* whatsoever. On the contrary, had they held *Justification* to be by *Faith in Moses*, and not in JESUS,

JESUS, then it had been the Apostle's Business to prove, that it was the *specific Faith in JESUS*. But as the Dispute stood, all he had to do was to prove that it was *the Act of Believing*, and not *Works*, that justified. And this we find he does with infinite Force; by shewing, that that which made all the Patriarchs before the *Law*, and all the Rulers and Prophets under the *Law*, acceptable to God, was not *Works*, but *Faith*. But what kind of *Faith* then? Doubtless Faith in God: For he is arguing on their own Concessions. They admitted their Ancestors to have had *that Faith*: But not the *Faith in CHRIST*. The contending for *which*, had therefore been a kind of begging the Question. Thus we see that not only the *Pertinency*, but the *whole Force* of the Argumentation turns on our understanding *Faith* in this Chapter to mean *Faith in the God of their Fathers*.

But the Apostle's own *Definition* of the Word in Question, puts the Matter out of Dispute. We have said it necessarily required him to speak of the Efficacy of *Faith in the Abstract*. Accordingly his *Definition* of FAITH is this: It is, says he, THE SUBSTANCE OF THINGS HOPED FOR, THE EVIDENCE OF THINGS NOT SEEN^s. Not of *Faith in the Messiah*, but of Belief in *general*, and on good Grounds. Indeed *very general*; not only *Belief* of the *future*, but the *past*. 'Tis, says the Divine Writer, *the Substance of Things hoped for*; and this he illustrates by Noah's Reliance on God's Promise to save him in the general Deluge^t. 'Tis, again, *the Evidence of Things not seen*; and this he illustrates by our *Belief* that *the Worlds were framed by the Word of God*^v. Having defined what he means by *Faith*, he next proceeds to shew its *Nature* by its

^s y 1. ^t y 7. ^v y 3.

general

general Efficacy: — *But without Faith it is impossible to please him [God] for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a Rewarder of them that diligently seek him^w*; which very *Faith* he immediately illustrates by *that* of Noah, Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, and Moses: and that no Doubt might remain, he farther illustrates it by the *Faith* of the Jewish People passing the Red Sea, and encompassing the Walls of Jericho; and by the *Faith* of Rahab the Harlot. But was any of this *Faith* in JESUS the Messiah, or a Belief of a Future State of Rewards and Punishments?

As here the Apostle tells us of the great *Rewards of Faith*, so in his *third Chapter* he speaks of the *Punishment of Unbelief*; which was the shutting out a whole Generation from the Land of Canaan, and suffering them to perish in the Wilderness: *So we see* (says he) *they could not enter in because of Unbelief^x*. But was this *Unbelief* want of Faith in the Messiah, or only Want of Faith in the Promise of the God of Israel, who assured them he would drive out the Canaanite from before them? Lastly, to evince it impossible that *Faith in the Messiah* should be meant by the *Faith* in this *eleventh Chapter*, the Apostle expressly says, that all those, to whom he assigns this Faith, HAD NOT RECEIVED THE PROMISE^y. Therefore they could not have Faith in that which was never yet proposed to them for the Object of *Faith*: *For how should they believe in him of whom they have not heard?* says the Apostle.

St. Paul had the same Argument to manage in his *Epistle to the Galatians*; and he argues, from the Advantages of *Faith* or *Belief in God*, in the very same Way. But of his Argument, more in the next Section.

^w y 6.

^x y 19.

^y y 13 and 39.

Let us observe farther, that the sacred Writers not only use the Word *Faith* in its generic Sense of *believing on reasonable Grounds*; but likewise the Word GOSPEL (a more appropriated Term) for *good Tidings in general*. Thus this very Writer to the *Hebrews* — *For unto us was the GOSPEL preached as well as unto them^z*, i. e. the *Israelites*.

3. But of these Patriarchs it is said, that they *saw the Promises afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and desired a better Country, that is, an Heavenly^a*. — This, it is my Business to prove in the next Section. And if I should say I propose to do it more effectually than these Objectors have ever done, I believe no body will think I pretended to any great Matter. But then it is evident, that the Writer of this Epistle meant, that none but the Patriarchs and Leaders of the *Jewish* People saw these Promises afar off, or longed for a better Country than *Canaan*; because he confines that spiritual Knowledge expressly to the Patriarchs and Leaders; and, at the same Time, farther assures us, that even *THEY had not received the Promise, though they had obtained a good Report through Faith^b*. — I know not whether it be superfluous to observe, that where it is said — *Others were tortured, not accepting Deliverance, that they might obtain a better Resurrection^c*, refers, as our *English* Bibles shew us, to the History of the *Maccabees*; in whose Time it is confessed the Doctrine of a *Future State* became national.

III.

This is all I could hear of in the Way of Objection to my Opinion; and this *all* is such a Confirmation of it, that I am in Pain lest the Reader should think I prevaricate, and draw out the

^z Chap. iv. § 2.

^a § 13 and 16.

^b § 39.

^c § 35.

strongest Texts in the *New Testament* to support my Proposition, under the Name of Objections to it. But I have fairly given them as I found them urged, and to shew that I am not less *severe*, though a little more *candid*, to my own Opinions, than my Adversaries, I shall produce an Objection that occurred to me in reading St. *Paul's* Epistles, of more Weight than all their Arguments put together. It is this:

The *learned Apostle*, in his Reasonings against the *Jews*, especially in his *Epistle* to the *Romans*, argues upon this Supposition, that “By the Law they had
“ eternal Life offered to them or laid before them,
“ on Condition of their exact Performance of the
“ Commandment; but that all coming short of
“ perfect Obedience, there was a Necessity of pro-
“ curing it by Faith.” — *For what the Law could not do* (says he) *in that it was weak through the Flesh,* God sending his own Son in the Likeness of sinful *Flesh*, and for Sin condemned Sin in the *Flesh*: that the Righteousness of the Law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the *Flesh*, but after the Spirit^d.

To understand the Force of this general Argument, which runs through the Epistles to the *Romans* and *Galatians*, we must consider his End and Purpose in writing them. It was to reform an Error in the *Jewish* Converts, who would lay a Necessity upon all Men of conforming to the Law of *Moses*. As strangely superstitious as this may appear to us at present, it seems to have been a very natural Consequence of Opinions then held by the whole *Jewish* Nation, as Doctrines of *Moses* and the Law: These were, a future State of Rewards and Punishments, and the Resurrection of the Body. Now these Doctrines, which disposed the better Part of the *Jews* the easier to receive the Gospel where

^d ROM. viii. 3, 4.

they were taught more expressly and explicitly, at the same Time gave them wrong Notions both of the Religion of *Moses* and of *JESUS*. Which, by the way, I desire those, who so much contend for a future State's being in the *Mosaic* Dispensation, to take notice of. — Their wrong Notion of the *Law* consisted in this, that having taken it for granted, that the Reward of Obedience proposed by *Moses*, was *Immortality*; and that this *Immortality* could be obtained only by the *Works* of the *Law*, therefore those *Works* were, *necessarily*, to be performed. Their wrong Notion of the *Gospel* consisted in this, that as *Immortality* was attached to *Works* by the *Law*, it must needs be attached to *Works* by the *Gospel* also.

These were fatal Mistakes. We have seen in our Explanation of the *eleventh Chapter* to the *Hebrews*, how the Apostles combated the last of them, namely *Justification by Works*. The shewing now how *St. Paul* opposed the other, of *Obligation to the Law*, will explain the Reasoning in Question. The Opinion of Obligation to the *Law of Moses*, was, as we say, founded on this Principle, that it taught a *future State*, or offered *Immortality* to its Followers. The Case was nice and delicate, and the Confutation of the Error required much Address. What should our Apostle do? Should he in direct Terms deny a future State was to be found in the *Law*? This would have shocked an universal Tradition supported by a national Belief. Should he have owned that Life and *Immortality* came by the *Law*? This had not only fixed them in their Error, but, what was worse, had been subverting the whole *Gospel of JESUS*. He has Recourse therefore to this admirable Expedient; The later *Jews*, in Support of their national Doctrine of a *future State*, had given a *spiritual* Sense to the *Law*. And this,

this, which they did out of Necessity, with little apparent Grounds of Conclusion then to be discovered, was seen after the coming of the *Messiah* to have the highest Reasonableness and Truth. But more of this Matter hereafter. This *spiritual Sense* the holy Apostle seized, and from thence argues, on *their own Principles*, that the Law of *Moses* could not be now obligatory, in this irresistible Manner. *The Law*, says he, *we know is spiritual^e*; that is, in a spiritual Sense promises Immortality: For it says, *Do this and live^f*. Therefore *he who does the Deeds of the Law shall live^g*. But what then? *I am carnal^h*: And *all have sinned, and come short of the Glory of Godⁱ*: So that no Flesh can be justified by the Deeds of the Law^k, which requires a perfect Obedience. Works then being profitless, we must have Recourse to Faith: But *the Law is not of Faith^l*: Therefore the Law is useless for the Attainment of Salvation, and consequently no longer obligatory. — Never was a momentous Argument more artfully conducted, where the Erroneous are brought into the right Way on their own Principles, and yet Truth not betrayed. This would have been admired in a Greek or Roman Writer.

But tho' the *Principle* he went upon was common to both him and his Adversaries, and consequently true, that the Law was *Spiritual*, or had a spiritual Meaning, whereby, under the Species of those temporal Promises of the *Law*, the Promises of the *Gospel* were shadowed out; yet the *Inference* from thence, that the *Law offered Immortality to its Followers*, was solely Jewish, and urged by St. Paul as

^e ROM. vii. 14. ^f LEV. xviii. 5. GAL. iii. 12.

^g ROM. x. 5. ^h ROM. vii. 14. ⁱ ROM. iii. 23.

^k GAL. ii. 16. Chap. iii. § 11. ^l GAL. iii. 12.

an Argument *ad hominem* only ; which appears certain from these Considerations :

1. First, Supposing St. *Paul* really to hold that the *Law* offered Immortality to its Followers, and that that Immortality was attached (as his Argument supposes it) to *Works*, it would contradict the other Argument, which both himself and the Author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* urge so cordially against the second Error of the *Jewish* Converts ; namely, that Immortality was attached to *Works*, or that Justification was by *Works* under the *Gospel* : For to confute this Error, they prove, as we have shewn, that it was *Faith* which justified, not only under the *Gospel*, but under the *Law* also.

2. Secondly, If Immortality were indeed offered thro' *Works*, by the *Law*, then Justification by *Faith*, one of the great fundamental Doctrines of Christianity^m, would be infringed. For then *Faith* could, at best, be only supposed to make up the Defect of *Works*, in such a Sense as to enable *Works* to justify.

3. Thirdly, It would directly contradict what St. *Paul* in other Places says of the *Law* ; as that it is a Shadow of Things to come, but that the Body is of CHRISTⁿ. That it is the Schoolmaster to bring Men to CHRIST^o. But the Offer of Immortality on one Condition, could not be called the Shadow of the Offer of it on another.

I will only observe, that the excellent Mr. *Locke* was not aware of the Nature of the Argument in Question ; and so, on its mistaken Authority, has supposed the *Law* did indeed offer Immortality to

^m This I shall shew to be so ; and rescue it from the Madness of Enthusiasm on the one hand, and the Absurdity of System on the other ; and yet not betray it, in explaining it away under the fashionable Pretence of delivering the *Scripture Doctrine* of it.

ⁿ COL. ii. 17. ^o GAL. iii. 24.

its Followers: This hath run him into great Perplexities in his Explanation of St. *Paul's Epistles*.

Thus have we at length proved our third Proposition, *That the Doctrine of a Future State of Rewards and Punishments is not to be found in, nor did make Part of the Mosaic Dispensation*; and, as we presume, to the Satisfaction of every capable and impartial Reader.

But to give these Arguments Credit with those who determine only by Authority, I shall in the last Place support them with the Opinion of one of the most illustrious Writers the *English Church* ever produced, the learned Bishop *Bull*: “*Primo quaeritur (says this excellent Person) an in V. Testamento nullum omnino extet vitae aeternae promissum? de eo enim à nonnullis dubitatur. Resp. Huic quaestioni optimè mihi videtur respondere Augustinus, distinguens nomen Veteris Testamenti: nam eo intelligi ait aut pactum illud, quod in Monte Sinai factum est, aut omnia, quæ in Mose, Hagiographis, ac Prophetis continentur. Si Vetus Testamentum posteriori sensu accipiatur, concedi FORSITAN possit, esse in eo nonnulla futuræ vitae non obscura indicia; præsertim in Libro Psalmorum, Daniele, & Ezekiele: quanquam vel in his libris clarum ac disertum aeternæ vitae promissum VIX AC NE VIX quidem reperias. Sed hæc QUALIACUNQUE erant, non erant nisi præludia & anticipationes gratiæ Evangelicæ, AD LEGEM NON PERTINEBANT. — Lex enim promissa habuit terrena, & terrena TANTUM. — Si quis contra sentiat, ejus est locum dare, ubi aeternæ vitae promissio extat; QUOD CERTE IMPOSSIBILE EST. — Sub his autem verbis [legis ipsius] Dei intentione comprehensam fuisse vitam aeternam, ex interpretatione ipsius Christi ejusque Apostolorum manifestum est. Verùm hæc non sufficiunt ut dica-*

“ mus vitam æternam in Fœdere Mosaico promissam
 “ fuisse. Nam primò promissa, præsertim Fœderi
 “ annexa, debent esse clara ac diserta, & ejusmodi, ut
 “ ab utraque parte stipulante intelligi possint. Pro-
 “ missa autem hæc TYPICA & generalia, non ad-
 “ ditâ aliunde interpretatione, PENE IMPOSSIBILE
 “ ERAT, UT QUIS ISTO SENSU INTELLIGERET P.”

My Adversaries may now blush perhaps to find whom they have been all this Time abusing. But it will be but Charity to keep them in Countenance, while we shew the Reader, that some of their Betters have given as bad Words before them: “ Quam
 “ propè abest (says one of the Bishop's Adversaries to the foregoing Account of the *Mosaic* Dispensation) “ à BLASPHEMIA hæc Legis Mosaicæ derogatio, quæ Christi verbis in parabola de epulone disertè adversatur, Luc. xvi. 29. & alibi expressis? “ Vide Joh. v. 39. Hoc ex SOCINI lacunis hauris. “ Mosen non magis quam SADDUCÆI, quos Scripturæ imperitos Christus redarguit, intelligis. — “ Cohibe, obsecro, linguæ petulantiam adversus Dei “ sapientem œconomiam blaterantis — DEUM CON- “ VITIIS PETIS — LEGEM puram & sanctam CALUMNIIS oneras, quasi ipsa esset avaritiæ & intemperantiæ nutrix^q. PUTIDUS CERTE EST FONS,

P *Harmonia Apostolica*, Dissert. posterior, cap. x. § 8. p. 474. inter *Opera Omnia*, Ed. 1721.

^q There are a Set of dirty Calumnies that go from one foul Mouth to another, without ever being the worse for wearing. This is one of them: And this Railer stole it from the famous *Peter Baro*, who wrote *De Præstantia & Dignitate Divinæ Legis*, a Book of so singular a Composition, that just one Half of it confutes the other. *Baro* having said, with a strange Degree of Rashness, that, if the Rewards and Punishments of the *Law* were only *temporary*, it could not be supposed to come from GOD, p. 55. he afterwards gives a kind of Reason for so scandalous an Assertion: Si Lex nihil præter hanc vitam spectat, cogitandumve proponit, quorsum de virtute præcipit? Si enim nihil nisi hujus vitæ commoda sint nobis quærenda, *nulla vera virtus* esse potest, “ unde

“ unde hæc scaturiit corrupta & insalubris commu-
“ nicatio^r. ”

S E C T. V.

BUT tho' it appears a *Future State of Rewards and Punishments made no Part of the Mosaic Dispensation*, yet the *Law* had certainly a *spiritual Meaning*, to be understood when the *Fulness of Time* should come. In the *interim*, the *Mystery* of the Gospel was occasionally revealed to God's chosen Servants, the *Leaders and Fathers* of the *Jewish People*; and the *Dawning* of it gradually revealed to the *People* by the *Prophets*.

All which is exactly agreeable to what our excellent CHURCH in its *seventh Article*, teaches concerning this Matter.

A R T I C L E VII.

The Old Testament is not contrary to the New: For both in the Old and New Testament everlasting Life is offered to Mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign, that the Old Fathers did look only for transitory Promises.

sed tantum *astutia & calliditas, nec sincerus ullus Dei cultus, sed hypocrisis*, p. 63. But he who will, at this time of day, take his *Reasoning* with his *Calumny* must have lost both *Sense and Shame*, as well as good *Manners*. The true *Foundation of Morality* is the *Will of God*. But is not the practical *Distinction* between *right* and *wrong* perpetually enforced by the *Law of Moses* on this Principle, the *Spring and Origin* of all true *Virtue*? and, to give it the greatest *Efficacy*, the *Love and Fear* of *God* is *there* likewise incessantly inculcated. But how does a long or short *Existence*, a *Life here or elsewhere*, at all affect the *Truth and Integrity* of *Virtue* so founded? Those who talk at this rate can have no better *Idea* of *Virtue* than the *Pagan Slave* in the *Poet*:

— Sum bonus ac frugi: renuit negitatque Sabellus.

^r *Examen Censuræ*, p. 617 & 620 ejusdem Edit.

The Old Testament is not contrary to the New. This Proposition is directed against the *Manichean* Error, to which the Opinions of some Sectaries of that Time seemed to approach. The *Manicheans* fancied there was a good and evil Principle; and that the *old* Dispensation was under the *evil*, and the *new* the Work of the *good*. Now we have proved that the *Old Testament* is so far from being contrary to the *New*, that it was the Foundation, Rudiments, and Preparation for it.

— *For both in the Old and New Testament everlasting Life is offered to Mankind by CHRIST, who is the only Mediator between God and Man.* That the CHURCH meant not by these Words, that everlasting Life was offered to Mankind by CHRIST in the *Old Testament* in the SAME MANNER it is offered by the *New*, is evident from these Considerations:

1. The CHURCH, in the preceding Words, only says, *the Old Testament is NOT CONTRARY to the New*; but did she mean that everlasting Life was offered by both, in the *same manner*, she would certainly have said, *The Old Testament is THE SAME with the New*. This farther appears from the Inference drawn from the Proposition concerning *everlasting Life* — WHEREFORE *they are not to be heard, which feign, that the old FATHERS did look only for transitory Promises.* But was the Sense in Question the true, then the Inference had been, *That ALL THE ISRAELITES did look for more than transitory Promises.*

2. The CHURCH could not mean that everlasting Life is offered in the *Old and New Testament* in the *same manner*, because we learn from *St. Austin*, that this was one of the old *Pelagian* Heresies, condemned by the Catholics in the Synod of *Diospolis*, — QUOD LEX SIC MITTAT AD REGNUM [COELORUM]

LORUM] QUEMADMODUM ET EVANGELIUM^s.

What was meant therefore by the Words — *Both in the Old and New Testament everlasting Life is offered to Mankind by CHRIST*, was plainly this — “That the Offer of everlasting Life to Mankind by CHRIST in the *New Testament* was shadowed out in the *Old*; the spiritual Meaning of the *Law* and the *Prophets* referring to that Life and Immortality, brought to Light by JESUS CHRIST.”

But lastly, Whatever Meaning the CHURCH had in these Words, it cannot at all affect our Proposition, *that a Future State was not taught by the Law of Moses*; because by *the Old Testament* is ever meant both the *Law* and the *Prophets*. Now I own the *Prophets* gave strong Intimations of the *everlasting Life* offered to Mankind by JESUS CHRIST.

The last Words of the Article which relate to this Matter, say, — *Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign, that the OLD FATHERS did look only for transitory Promises*; and so say I, if JESUS himself is to be heard; who affirms the direct contrary, of the *Father of the Faithful* in particular. *Your Father Abraham* (says he to the unbelieving *Jews*) *rejoiced to see my Day, and he saw it and was glad^t*. And here a proper Occasion offers itself to remove a seeming Contradiction between the Writer of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, and St. Paul, in his Speech to the Synagogue at *Antioch*. The former, speaking of the faithful *Israelites* in general, says, *And these all having obtained a good Report through Faith, RECEIVED NOT THE PROMISE^v*. And the latter, THE PROMISE WHICH WAS MADE UNTO THE

^s De Gestis Pelagii, c. xi. § 24.

^t JOHN viii. 56.

^v HEB. xi. 39.

FATHERS, *God hath fulfilled the same unto us their Children, in that he hath raised up JESUS again^w.* This, as we say, seems to contradict the foregoing, but it only *seems*: They are very consistent with one another. The Writer to the *Hebrews* is speaking of the Condition of the Faithful in general, under the Law; who certainly had not the Promise of the Gospel revealed unto them: St. *Paul*, in his Speech to the Synagogue, is speaking particularly of their Father *Abraham*, as appears from his Introductory Address, *Men and Brethren, Children of the Stock of Abraham^x*, who certainly had the Promise of the Gospel revealed unto him, as appears from the Words of *Jesus* quoted above. And this Solution the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews* himself directs us to, who, tho' he had said that the holy Men in general *received not the Promise*, yet when he reckons up the distinct *Effects* of each particular Man's *Faith*, he expressly says, — *who thro' Faith subdued Kingdoms, wrought Righteousness, OBTAINED PROMISES, stopped the Mouths of Lions, quenched the Violence of Fire^y, &c.* That is, some like *David*, thro' Faith, subdued Kingdoms; others, like *Samuel*, wrought Righteousness; others, like *Abraham*, obtained Promises; others, as *Daniel*, stopped the Mouths of Lions; and others, again, as his three Companions, quenched the Violence of Fire. From whence I would infer these two Consequences:

1. That as the *Promise* here said to be *obtained*, doth not contradict what the same Writer says presently after, that the faithful *Israelites* in general *received not the Promise*; and as the *Promise*, said by St. *Paul* to be *made to the Fathers*, means the same

^w ACTS xiii. 32.^x *Y* 26.^y HEB. xi. 33.

thing with the *Promises* said, by the Writer of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, to be *obtained*, namely the Promises made to *Abraham who saw CHRIST's Day*, consequently, neither do the Words of St. Paul contradict the Writer of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, where he says, *these all received not the Promise*.

2. As these Gospel *Promises* are said to be *obtained by Faith*, it follows that the FAITH mentioned in this famous Eleventh Chapter to the *Hebrews*, could not be *Faith in the Messiah*: Because the Promises of a Messiah are here said to be the Consequence of Faith; but *Faith in the Messiah* is the Consequence of the *Promises* of a Messiah: *For how could they believe in him of whom they had not heard?* From whence it appears, that the FAITH so much extolled in this Chapter was *Faith in God's Veracity*, according to the Interpretation given above.

That *Abraham* then *rejoiced to see CHRIST's Day, and saw it, and was glad*, is not only most certain, but of the highest Importance to be rightly understood. And that I may not be suspected of Prevarication on this Head, I shall illustrate God's Truth by the noblest Instance that ever was given of the *Harmony* between the *Old and New Testament*.

I.

For I persuade myself the *learned* Reader will be well content to stop a Moment with me, while I take Occasion, from these very remarkable Words of JESUS, to explain the History of the famous COMMAND TO ABRAHAM TO OFFER UP HIS SON; for to this History I shall prove they refer, being enabled, by their Aid, to give the true Solution of those inexplicable Difficulties, which have been so long the Stumbling-block of Infidelity.

In

In the Sense this extraordinary History hath been hitherto understood, the best Apology for *Abraham's* Behaviour (and it is hard that we should be, at this Time of Day, obliged to make Apologies for that Action, which in the Sight of God was of greatest Merit) seems to be this, that having had much Intercourse with God, whose Revelations spoke him a good and just Being, he concluded that this *Command to sacrifice his Son*, conveyed to him by the like strong and clear Impression on his Senses with the rest, came also from the same God. How rational soever this Solution be, the Deist, perhaps, would be apt to tell us, that it only puts him in mind of *Electra's* Answer to *Orestes*, who, staggering in his Purpose to kill his Mother, as commanded by *Apollo*, says: *But if, after all, this should be an evil Demon, who, bent on Mischief, hath assumed the Form of a God?* She replies, *What, an evil Demon possess the sacred Tripod?* 'Tis not to be supposed^v.

However, after saving and reserving to ourselves the Benefit of all those Arguments hitherto brought to support the History of this *Command*, which Arguments I really think of great Weight and Validity; I beg leave to say, that the Source of all the Difficulty is the very wrong Idea Men have been taught to entertain of it, while it was considered as given for a TRIAL ONLY of *Abraham's* Faith, and consequently as a Revelation unsought by him, and unrelated to any of the preceding, vouchsafed unto him; whereas, in Truth, it was a Revelation *ardently desired*, had the *closest Connexion* with, and

^v Ορ. Ἄρ' αὐτ' ἀλάσως εἶπ' ἀπεικαθεὶς θεῶν;
 Ηλ. Ἰερὸν καθίζων τρίποδ'; Ἐγὼ μὲν εἰδοκῶ.

Eurip. Electra, § 979.

was,

was, indeed, the *Completion* of all the foregoing; which were all directed to a great End, as the gradual View of the orderly Parts of one intire Dispensation; consequently the principal Purpose of the Command was not to try *Abraham's* Faith, altho' its Nature was such, that, in the very giving of it, *God did*, indeed, *tempt Abraham*^w.

In plain Terms, the *Action* was enjoined as the Conveyance of Information to the *Actor*, of something he had requested to know; this Mode of Information, by *Signs* instead of *Words*, being, as we have shewn, of common Practice in those early Ages: And as the Force of the following Reasoning is founded on that ancient Custom, I must request the Reader carefully to review what hath been said between the 81st and 96th Pages of this Volume, concerning the Origin, Progress, and various Modes of personal Converse; where it is shewn, that the conveying Information, and giving Directions to another, by Signs and Actions, instead of Words, was of general Practice in the first rude Ages; and how, in Conformity thereto, God was pleased frequently to converse with the holy Patriarchs and Prophets in that very Manner.

Laying down, therefore, what hath been said on this Subject, in the place referred to, as a *Postulatum*, I undertake to prove the following *Proposition*:

I.

THAT WHEN GOD SAYS TO ABRAHAM, *TAKE NOW THY SON, THINE ONLY SON ISAAC, &c.*^x THE COMMAND IS MERELY AN INFORMATION BY ACTION INSTEAD OF WORDS, OF THE GREAT SACRIFICE FOR THE REDEMPTION OF MANKIND GIVEN AT THE EARNEST REQUEST OF ABRAHAM,

^w GEN. xxii. 1.^x GEN. xxii. 2.

WHO LONGED IMPATIENTLY TO SEE CHRIST'S DAY; and, in its Nature, EXACTLY the same as those where he says to one Prophet: *Make thee Bonds and Yokes, and put them on thy Neck*^y; to another, *Go take unto thee a Wife of Whoredoms*^z, &c. and to a third: *Prepare thee Stuff for removing*^a, &c. that is, an Information of his Purpose by *Action* instead of *Words*; where, in the first Case, he foretells the Conquests of *Nebuchadnezzar* over *Edom*, *Moab*, *Ammon*, *Tyre*, and *Zidon*; in the second he declares his Abhorrence of the Idolatries of the House of *Israel*; and in the third, the approaching Captivity of *Zedekiah*.

The Foundation of my *Thesis* I lay in that Scripture of *St. John*, where JESUS says to the unbelieving *Jews*, YOUR FATHER ABRAHAM REJOICED TO SEE MY DAY; AND HE SAW IT, AND WAS GLAD^b.

I. If we consider *Abraham's* personal Character, together with the Choice made of him for Head and Origin of that People, which God would make holy and separate to himself, from whence was to arise the *Redeemer* of Mankind, the ultimate End of that Separation, we cannot but conclude it probable, that the Knowledge of this *Redeemer* would be revealed to him. *Shall I hide from Abraham the Thing which I do*^c? says GOD, in a Matter that much less concerned the *Father of the Faithful*. And here, in the Words of JESUS, we have this probable Fact, arising from the Nature of the Thing, made certain and put out of all reasonable Question. — *Abraham rejoiced*, says JESUS, *to see my DAY*, τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμὴν. Now when the figurative Word *Day* is used, not to express in general *the Period of*

^y JEREM. xxvii. 2.^z HOSEA i. 2.^a EZEK. xii. 3.^b Chap. viii. § 56.^c GEN. xviii. 17.

any one's Existence, but to denote his peculiar Office and Employment, it must needs signify that very Circumstance in his Life, which is *characteristic* of such Office and Employment. But JESUS is here speaking of his peculiar Office and Employment, as appears from the Occasion of the Dispute, which was his saying, *If any Man keep my Commandments, he shall never taste of Death*^d, intimating thereby the Virtue of his Office of Redeemer. Therefore by the Word DAY must needs be meant that *characteristic* Circumstance of his Life. But that Circumstance was his laying it down for the Redemption of Mankind. Consequently by the Word DAY is meant *the great Sacrifice of CHRIST*. Hence we may discover the real or affected Ignorance of the Socinian Comment upon this Place; which would have Day only to signify in general the Life of CHRIST, or the Period of his abode here on Earth.

2. But not only the *Matter*, but the *Manner*, likewise, of this great Revelation, is delivered in the Text. — *Abraham rejoiced to see my Day, and he SAW it and was glad.* — ἵνα ἴΔΗ: τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμὴν, ἢ ΕἶΔΕ — This evidently shews it to have been made, not by *Relation* in Words, but by REPRESENTATION in Action. The Verb εἶδω is frequently used, in the New Testament, in its proper Signification, to *see sensibly*. But whether literally or figuratively, it always denotes a full Intuition. That the Expression was as strong in the Syriac Language, used by JESUS, as here in the Greek of his Historian, appears from the Reply the Jews made to him — *Thou art not yet fifty Years old, and hast thou SEEN Abraham*^e? Plainly intimating that they understood the Assertion of *Abraham's seeing Christ's Day* to be a real beholding him in Person.

^d JOHN viii. 52. ^e ὡς 57.

We must conclude therefore, from the Words of the Text, that the Redemption of Mankind was not only revealed to *Abraham*, but was revealed likewise by *Representation*. A late Writer, not so well known as he deserves, or perhaps, to save the Times he lived in from the Opprobrium of so much neglected Merit, it might be better he were entirely forgotten; this Writer, I say, extremely well skilled in the *Style* of Scripture, was so sensible of the Force of *JESUS's* Words, that, though he had no Suspicion they related to any Part of *Abraham's* recorded History, yet he saw plainly they implied an Information by Representation — *Thus also Abraham* (says he) *saw the Day of CHRIST and was glad. But this must be in a Typical or Prophetical Vision*^f.

So far, then, is clear, that *Abraham* had indeed this Revelation. The next Question will be, whether we can reasonably expect to find it in the History of his Life, recorded in the Old Testament? And this, both the Words of *JESUS*, and the Nature of the Thing assure us that we may.

I. We find, by the History of *CHRIST's* Ministry, that, in his Disputations with the *Jews*, he never urged them with any Circumstance of God's Dispensations to their Forefathers, which they either were not, or might not be, well acquainted with, by the Study of their Scriptures. The Reason is evident. His Credentials were twofold, *Scripture* and *Miracles*. In the first Way therefore of confirming his Mission, if instead of appealing to the Course of God's Dispensation to his chosen People, as delivered in Scripture, he had given them an unknown History of that Dispensation, this had

^f *Daubuz* on the *Revelations*, p. 251. Printed in the Year 1720.

been so far from supporting his Character, that it would have heightened the Prejudices of Unbelievers towards him : as looking like a Confession that the known History was against him ; — and that he was forced to invent a new one to countenance his Pretensions. He must, therefore, for the necessary Support of his Character, appeal to some acknowledged Facts. These were all contained in *Scripture* and *Tradition*. But, we know, he always studiously declined supporting himself on their *Traditions*, though so full of Circumstances favourable to the Religion he came to propagate, such as the Doctrines of *eternal Life*, and *Resurrection of the Body* ; nay, took all Occasions of decrying their *Traditions* as impious Corruptions, by which they *had rendered* the written *Word of God* of none Effect. We conclude, therefore, from JESUS's own Words, that the Circumstance of *Abraham's* Knowledge of his *Day* is certainly to be found in *Abraham's* History : Not in so clear a Manner, indeed, as to be understood by a *carnal-minded* Jew, nor even by a *System-making* Christian, for Reasons hereafter to be explained ; yet certainly there, and certainly proved to be there, by the best Rules of Logic and Criticism.

2. But though this did not appear from the Words of JESUS, yet it would from the very Nature of the Thing. For admit only the Fact, that *Abraham did see CHRIST's Day*, and it is utterly incredible that so capital a Circumstance should be omitted in his History, a sacred Record, preordained for one of the Supports and Evidences of CHRIST's Religion. That it could not, in the Book of *Genesis*, be delivered in Terms plainly to be understood by the People, during the first Periods of a preparatory Dispensation, is very certain ; as will be seen hereafter. But then this is far from a Reason of its not being

being recorded at all; great Ends, such as supporting the Truth of the following Dispensation, being to be gained by the Delivery of it in so obscure a Manner.

Having thus far cleared our Way, and shewn, that *the Doctrine of Redemption* was revealed to *Abraham*; and that the History of that Revelation is recorded in Scripture; we proceed to the Proof of these two Points,

I. That there is no Place, in the whole History of *Abraham*, but this, where he is commanded to offer up his Son, which bears the least Marks or Traces of such a Revelation.

II. That this Command to offer up his Son has all the Marks of, and is indeed, that very Revelation.

I. To prove the first Point, it will be necessary to give a short Abstract of *Abraham's* Story: in which we find a *regular* Account of the Course and Order of God's Dispensations to him, from the Time of his being called out of *Chaldea*, to the Command to offer up his Son *Isaac*, the last of God's Revelations to him, recorded in Scripture.

The first Notice given us of this Patriarch is in the Account of his Genealogy, Family, and Country^g. We are then told^h, that God called him from his Father's House to *a Land which he should shew him*: And to excite his Obedience, he promises to make of him *a great Nation*ⁱ; to take him under his peculiar Protection, and to *make all the Nations of the Earth blessed through him*^k. The last Part of this Promise is remarkable, as containing the proper End of God's Choice and Separation of him and his Posterity; and so, very fitly made, by the

^g GEN. xi. v. 27, & seq.

^h Chap. xii. v. 1.

ⁱ v. 2.

^k v. 3.

facred Writer, the Foundation of the History of God's Dispensations to him, and a Mark to direct the Reader to what they are all, ultimately, to be referred. When *Abraham*, in Obedience to this Command, was come into the Land of *Canaan*^l, God vouchsafed him a farther Revelation of his Will; and now told him, that *this* was the Land (which he had before said he *would shew him*) to be inherited by *his Seed*^m. When he returned from *Egypt*, God revealed himself still farther to him, and marked out the *Bounds*ⁿ of that Land, which he assured him should be *to him and to his Seed for ever*^o. Which *Seed* should be *as the Dust of the Earth* for number^p. After all these gracious and repeated Assurances, we may well suppose *Abraham* to be grown uneasy at his Wife's Barrenness, and his own Want of Seed to inherit the Promises. Accordingly, we find him much disturbed with these Apprehensions^q; and that God, to quiet his Fears, appeared to him in a *Vision*, and said, *Fear not, Abram, I am thy Shield and exceeding great Reward*. *Abraham*, thus encouraged to tell his Grief, owned it was for his Want of Issue; and for that he suspected the promised Blessings were to be inherited by his adopted Children, the Sons of his Servant *Eliezer of Damascus*^r. To ease him of this Apprehension, God was now pleased to acquaint him, that his Design was not that an adopted Son should inherit, but one *out of his own Bowels*^s. And, for farther Assurance, he instructs him in the various Fortune of his Posterity — *That his Seed should be a Stranger in a Land that was not theirs, which Land should afflict them four hundred Years, and that then he would judge that Nation, and af-*

^l y 5.^m y 7.ⁿ Chap. xiii. y 14.^o y 15.^p y 16.^q Chap. xv. y 1,^r y 2, 3.^s y 4.

terwards

terwards bring them out with great Substance to inherit the Land of Canaan^t. At the same Time God more particularly marks out the Bounds of the promised Land, and reckons up the several Nations that then inhabited it^v. Things being in this Train, and *Abraham* now satisfied that the Seed of his Loins were to inherit the Promises, *Sarah*, on Account of her Sterility, persuaded her Husband to go in unto her Hand-maid *Hagar*, the *Egyptian*^w. In this she indulged her own Ambition by procuring a Son whom she might adopt: *It may be* (says she) *that I may obtain Children by her*^x: And likewise flattered herself that she was, at the same Time, instrumental in promoting the Designs of Providence. *Behold now* (says she) *the Lord hath restrained me from bearing*. To this Project *Abraham* consented. *Hagar* conceived, and bare a Son called *Ishmael*^y. He was now fully satisfied; he grew fond of *Ishmael*, and reckoned upon him for the Inheritor of the Promises. To correct this Mistake, God vouchsafed him a new Revelation^z: In which he is told, that God would not only (as had been before promised) bless and multiply his Posterity in an extraordinary Manner, but would separate them from all other Nations, and he would be their God, and they should be his peculiar People^a. And this *national Adoption* requiring a mutual Covenant, the Rite of CIRCUMCISION is, at the same Time, enjoined as the Mark of this Covenant^b. Lastly, *Abraham* is shewn his fond Mistake,

^t *ψ* 13, 14.^v *ψ* 18 to the End.^w Chap. xvi.^x *ψ* 2.^y *ψ* 15.^z Chap. xvii.^a *ψ* 7, & seq.

^b *ψ* 10, & seq. By the Account here given, of God's Dispen-
sations to *Abraham*, may be seen the Folly of that Ob-
jection, brought with such Insinuations of Importance, against
the *Divine* Appointment of *Circumcision*, from the Time of its
Institution. Sir *John Marsham* observes, that *Abraham*, when
he went into Egypt, was not circumcised, nor for twenty Years
and

and told, that it was not the Son of the Bond-woman, but of his Wife *Sarah*, who was ordained to be Heir of the Promises^c. But *Abraham* had so long indulged himself in his Mistake, and consequently in his Affection for *Ishmael*, that he begs

after his Return. *Abramus*, quando *Ægyptum* ingressus est, nondum circumciscus erat, neque per annos amplius viginti post reditum, p. 73. *Franeq. Ed. 4^{to}*. And then, that Circumcision was a most ancient Rite amongst the Egyptians, that they had it from the Beginning, and that it was a Principle with them not to make use of the Customs of other People. *Apud Ægyptios circumcidendi ritus vetustissimus fuit, & ἀπ' ἀρχῆς institutus. Illi nullorum aliorum hominum institutis uti volunt*, p. 74. The noble Author of the *Characteristics*, who never loses an Opportunity of expressing his Good-will to a Prophet or a Patriarch, takes up this pitiful Suspicion after *Marsham*: "Before the
 " Time that *Israel* was constrained to go down to *Egypt*, and
 " sue for Maintenance, — the Holy Patriarch *Abraham* himself
 " had been necessitated to this Compliance on the same Account. — 'Tis certain that if this Holy Patriarch, who first instituted the sacred Rite of Circumcision within his own Family or Tribe, had no Regard to any Policy or Religion of the Egyptians, yet he had formerly been a Guest and Inhabitant of *Egypt* (where Historians mention this to have been a national Rite) long ere he had received any divine Notice or Revelation concerning this Affair." Vol. iii. p. 52, 53. These great Men, we see, appeal, for the Support of their Insinuation, to *Scripture*, which had they considered with common Attention, they might have found that a Chronological Account is there given of God's gradual Revelations to the Holy Patriarch; and therefore that, according to the Order God was pleased to observe in his several Dispensations towards him, the Rite of Circumcision could not have been enjoined before the Time *Abraham* happened to go into *Egypt*, nor indeed at any other Time than that in which we find it given; consequently that his Journey into *Egypt* had not the least Concern or Connection with this Affair: Nay, had they but attended to their own Observation, that the Rite of Circumcision was instituted twenty Years after *Abraham's* Return from *Egypt*, they must have seen the Weakness of so partial a Suspicion. For had this been after the Model of an Egyptian Rite, *Abraham*, in all likelihood, had been circumcised in *Egypt*, or at least very soon after his Return: For in *Egypt* it was a Personal, not a Family Rite.

^c y 16.

VOL. II.

S s

GOD

GOD would indulge it too — O *that Ishmael might live before thee*^d. And GOD, in Compassion to his paternal Fondness, graciously promises, that the Posterity of *Ishmael* should become exceeding great and powerful^e: but that, nevertheless, his Covenant should be with *Isaac*, and with his Seed after him^f. However, this Revelation having been received with some kind of Doubt, as appears by the Words of the Historian^g, God was pleased to repeat the Promise of a Son by *Sarah*^h: and even to mark the Time of his Birthⁱ: according to which, *Sarah conceived and bare Abraham a Son*^k. After this, God revealed himself yet again to *Abraham*^l, with a Command to put away his Son *Ishmael*; and to assure him, that the chosen Posterity should come from *Isaac*. For *Abraham* was not yet cured of his unreasonable Fondness for *Ishmael*; but still reckoned on him as his *second Hopes*, in Case of any Misadventure to *Isaac*. This appears from *Ishmael's* insolent Behaviour^m; from *Abraham's* great Unwillingness to dismiss himⁿ; and from God's assuring him, in order to make him easy, *That in Isaac should his Seed be called*^o. We now come to the famous History of the Command to offer up his Son *Isaac*. And it came to pass, AFTER THESE THINGS, that God did tempt Abraham, and said: Take now thy Son, THINE ONLY SON Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee unto the Land of Moriah, and offer him there for a Burnt-offering upon one of the Mountains which I will tell thee of. And Abraham arose^p, &c. This was the last of God's Revelations to *Abraham* — And it came to pass after these Things — And with this, the History of them is closed.

^d y 18. ^e y 20, & seq. ^f y 19. ^g y 17.
^h Chap. xviii. ⁱ y 10, 14. ^k Chap. xxi. y 2.
^l y 12. ^m y 9. ⁿ y 11. ^o y 12.
^p Chap. xxii. y 1, 2, 3.

Here we see all these Revelations, except the last, are *plain* and *clear*, as relating to the temporal Blessings to be conferred on *Abraham* and his Posterity after the Flesh; and through him, some Way or other, on all Mankind. Not one of these therefore can pretend to be that Revelation of the *Redemption of Mankind*. The last is the only dark and obscure one of the whole; which, if indeed a Revelation of this grand Mystery, must, of Necessity, as we shall shew, be darkly and obscurely recorded.

But to this perhaps it may be objected, that the famous Promise of God to *Abraham*, that *in him should all Families of the Earth be blessed*^q, is that Revelation; because St. Paul calls this the Preaching of the Gospel unto him — *And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Heathen through Faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all Nations of the Earth be blessed*^r. To this I reply, that the Apostle is here convincing the *Galatians*, that the Gospel of CHRIST is founded on the same Principle with that which justified *Abraham*, namely *Faith*; *Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for Righteousness*^s. He then pursues his Argument in this Manner, *Therefore they which be of Faith are blessed with faithful Abraham*^t. The Reason he gives is the Promise in Question, given in Reward of *Abraham's Faith*, that *in him should all Nations be blessed*. This is the Force of the Argument; and it is very finely managed. But then the Terms *Faith* and *Gospel* are here used, as they very oft are in the Apostolic Writings^v, not in their *specific* but *generic* Sense, for *Confidence in any one*, and *glad Tidings in general*. For 'tis plain, *Abraham's Faith* here recommended, was not that

^q GEN. xii. 3.

^r GAL. iii. 8.

^s y 6.

^t y 9.

^v See what hath been said on this Subject in our Discourse on the xith Chap. to the *Hebrews*, p. 578.

Christian Faith in *JESUS* the *Messiah*, but Faith in *GOD*, who had promised to make his Posterity, according to the *Flesh*, as numerous as the Stars of *Heaven*, when as yet he had no Offspring^w. In a like Latitude *St. Paul* uses the Word *προεὐαγγελίζομαι*, to *preach the Gospel beforehand*, not the Tidings of the *Messiah* the Redeemer, but the Effects of it, Blessedness to the whole Race of Mankind. Tidings that indeed referred to a *future Dispensation*: and, in this, differing from his *Use* of the Word *Faith*, which did not. But then this is very far from his *seeing Christ's Day*. It was, indeed, the fundamental and preparatory Revelation, by which we are to estimate the ultimate End of all the following, and on which we must suppose them to be built; and so much we are concerned to prove it was. I conclude therefore, that, when *JESUS* says *Abraham saw his Day*; and *St. Paul*, that he *had the Gospel preached before unto him*, they spoke of two different Revelations. We come therefore,

II. To the second Point: which is to shew, that the Command to offer up *Isaac* was the very Revelation of *Christ's Day*, or the Redemption of Mankind by his Death and Sufferings.

I. We may observe, from this short View of *Abraham's History*, that all *GOD's Revelations* to him, even unto this last, open by Degrees, and relate, primarily indeed, to his Posterity according to the *Flesh*, but ultimately, to the whole Race of Mankind: as appears from that mystic Promise so early given him, as the Foundation of all the following, that *in him should all the Families of the Earth be blessed*. These are the great coincident Truths, to which all these Revelations tend. But according to the common Interpretation of the last of them, the

^w GEN. xv. 6.

famous Command in Question; this, which one would naturally expect to find the Confirmation and Completion of the rest, is made to have no Manner of Relation to them, but to be foreign to every Thing preceding. Hence we conclude, and reasonably, that there is something more in the Command than the common Interpretation, resting in the outside Relation, has yet discovered to us.

2. But this is not all. The Command, as it hath been hitherto understood, is not only quite disjoined from the rest of *Abraham's* History, but likewise occupies a Place in it, that, according to our Ideas of Things, it cannot properly have. The Command is supposed to be given as a Trial *only*. Now when the great *Searcher of Hearts* is pleased to *try* any of his Servants, either for Example sake, or for some other End, favourable of his Dispensations to Mankind, as in this he condescends to the Manner of Men, who cannot judge of the Merits of their inferior Agents without Trial; so we may be assured, he would accommodate himself to their Manner likewise in the most material Circumstance of the Trial. But amongst Men the Agent is always tried *before* he is set on Work or rewarded, and not *after*. When we come therefore to this Place, and see a Command *only* to tempt or try *Abraham*, we naturally expect, on his answering to the Trial, to find him greatly *employed* or *rewarded*. On the contrary, we are told, that this Trial was made after all his Work done, and all God's Mercies received; *and it came to pass after these Things* — nay, what is still more strange, after he had been once tried already. For the Promise to him, when he was yet childless, his Wife barren, and both of them far advanced in Age, that *his Seed should be as the Stars of Heaven for Multitude*, was a Trial of his Faith; and his believing, against

all Probability in a natural Way, the sacred Historian tells us, was *accounted to him for Righteousness*^x. Such therefore being the Method both of God and Men in this Matter, we must needs conclude, that the Command was not, according to the common Notion, *a Trial only*, because it comes *after* all God's Dispensations. Yet as the sacred Text assures us it was a *Trial*; and as a *Trial* necessarily precedes the Employment or Reward of the Person tried; we must needs conclude, that as no *Employment*, so some *Benefit* followed this Trial. Now, on our Interpretation, a Benefit, as we shall see, did follow; we have Reason therefore to conclude this Interpretation to be the true.

3. Having seen the Difficulties arising from the *common Interpretation* of the Command, let us view it now on the other Side, in the new Light in which we have adventured to place it. And here we shall find that every Circumstance of the Story concurs to support our Interpretation. From the View given of *Abraham's* History, we see, as was said before, how all God's Revelations to him, to this last, ultimately relate to that mystic fundamental Promise made to him, on his first Vocation, that *in him should all Families of the Earth be blessed*. God opens the Scheme of his Dispensations by exact and regular Steps, and the Revelations follow one another gradually and in Order. — *Abraham* is first commanded to go into a Land which should be shewn him — then that Land, to be possessed by his numerous Posterity, is exhibited to him — Its distinct Boundaries are afterwards marked out — He is next assured, while yet childless, that his Posterity, to which so much was promised, should not be from an adopted Son, but from one out of

^x GEN. XV. 6.

his own Loins — He is then told that this Son should be born of *Sarah* — Which is followed by the formal Execution of the Covenant confirmed by the Seal of Circumcision — After all this the Birth of *Isaac* is predicted : who being born at the appointed Time, — *Ishmael* is ordered to be sent away ; to design with more Certainty the other Son's Succession. Here we see, throughout a gradual Opening, and fit Preparation for some farther Revelation, which, in pursuance of this regular Scheme of progressive Dispensations, could be no other than that of the *Redemption of Mankind by the Messiah*, the Completion of the whole of God's Oeconomy, and the Explanation of his first and fundamental Revelation, *that in Abraham should all the Families of the Earth be blessed*. But the only remaining one, recorded by the sacred Historian, is the Command to offer up his Son *Isaac*. This Command therefore is the very Revelation which we seek. The Revelation which perfects all the foregoing, and makes the whole Series uniform and complete. And the Place in which we find it exactly suits such a Revelation, which, being the Completion of the rest, must needs be the last in Order.

4. Again, We find the Revelation of the Redemption of Mankind in that very Place where, if only *separately* considered, we should, according to all the Rules of human Reason, be disposed to expect it. This Revelation, as we shall prove from the Words of JESUS, *Abraham rejoiced to see my Day, and he saw it and was glad*, was ardently desired and sought after by him. Now the Happiness or Redemption of Mankind promised, on *Abraham's* first Vocation, to come thro' him, could not but make him more and more inquisitive into the Manner of its being brought about, in Proportion as he found himself to be more and more personally con-

cerned as the Instrument of so great a Blessing. But every new Revelation would shew him still farther interested in the Participation of that Honour; therefore, by the Time *Ishmael* was ordered to be sent away, and the promised Seed fixed in *Isaac*, we must needs suppose him very impatient to understand the Mystery of Redemption, and so fitly prepared to receive this last and supreme Revelation.

5. Farther, The new Light in which we place this Command, dispels all that Perplexity (taken notice of above) in our Ideas of a *Trial*, on the common Interpretation; where the *Trial* which should, in Use and Reason, go before some extraordinary Favour, is made to come after all. But now, according to our Sense of the Command, the *Trial*, as is fit, *precedes* the last and greatest Favour ever bestowed by God on *Abraham*.

6. To confirm all this, we may consider that this Interpretation of the Command is most easy and natural, as being entirely agreeable to the ancient Manner of communicating Information. We have shewn^y it to have been the general Custom of Antiquity, in personal Conferences, to instruct by *Actions* as well as *Words*; a Custom begun out of Necessity, but continued out of Choice for the superior Advantages it has in making an Impression. For *Motion*, naturally significative, which enters at the Eye, has a much stronger Effect than *Sound*, arbitrarily significative, that enters at the Ear. We have shewn likewise, by numerous Examples, that God himself vouchsafed, in Compliance to a general Custom, to use this Way of Information, when he instructed the holy Patriarchs and Prophets in his Will.

7. Lastly, As the high Importance of this Revelation seemed to require its being given in the strong and forcible Way of *Action*, so nothing can

^y See p. 81 to 96.

be conceived more apposite to convey the Information than *this very Action*. *Abraham* desired earnestly to be let into the Mystery of the Redemption; and GOD to instruct him (in the best Manner Humanity is capable of receiving Instruction) in the infinite Extent of his Goodness to Mankind, *who spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all^z*, let *Abraham* feel, by Experience, what it was to lose a beloved Son, — *Take now thy Son, thine only Son Isaac*; born miraculously when *Sarah* was past Child-bearing, as *Jesus* was born miraculously of a Virgin. So very exact too was this parabolical Representation, that the Duration of the Action, namely three Days, was the same as between CHRIST'S Death and Resurrection, both which were designed to be represented in it; and farther, that not only the *final antitypical* Sacrifice of the Son of GOD was figured in the *commanded* one of *Isaac*, but the *intermediate typical* Sacrifice in the *Mosaic* Oeconomy was represented by the *permitted* Sacrifice of the Ram offered up instead of *Isaac*.

The Sum then of the Argument is this — *JESUS* says expressly that *Abraham saw his Day*, or the great *Sacrifice* for the Sins of Mankind by *Representation* — The Records of sacred History must needs verify his Assertion. — But there is no Place in Scripture that presents the least Traces of this Revelation but the History of the Command to offer *Isaac* — This History not only easily and naturally *admits* of such a Sense, but *demands* it — And reciprocally, this Sense gives the greatest Light imaginable to the History; and removes the greatest Difficulties attending the common Interpretation of it. Hence, we certainly conclude, that the *Command to Abraham to offer up his Son* was only an Information in Action, which, at *Abraham's* earnest

^z ROM. viii. 32.

Request, God was graciously pleased to give him, of the *great Sacrifice of Christ for the Redemption of Mankind*. The Point to be proved.

The only plausible Objection that can be made to our Interpretation I conceive to be this, — “That
 “ what is here supposed the principal and proper
 “ Reason of the Command, is not at all mentioned
 “ by the sacred Historian ; but another, of a quite
 “ different Nature, assigned ; namely, the *Trial of*
 “ *Abraham’s Faith and Obedience*. — *And it came*
 “ *to pass after these Things God did tempt Abraham,*
 “ *and said, Take now thy Son, thine only Son Isaac.* —
 “ And when the Affair is over, the same Reason is
 “ again insinuated : — *By myself have I sworn, saith*
 “ *the Lord, for because thou hast done this Thing,*
 “ *and hast not withheld thy Son, thine only Son, that*
 “ *in blessing I will bless thee*^a,” &c.

I. To the *first Part* of the Objection I answer, That the Knowledge of God’s future Dispensation, in the *Redemption of Mankind by the Death of his Son*, revealed, as a singular Favour, to the *Father of the Faithful*, was what could by no means be communicated to the *Hebrew People*, when *Moses* wrote this History for their Use, because they being, at that Time, to continue long under a carnal Oeconomy, this Knowledge of the *End of the Law* would have greatly indisposed them to that Dispensation ; with which, as a *Schoolmaster*, that was to bring them by Degrees, thro’ a harsh and rugged Discipline, to the easy Yoke of CHRIST, GOD, in his infinite Wisdom, thought fit to exercise them. But he who does not see, from the plain Reason of the Thing, the Necessity of the Historian’s Silence, is referred, for farther Satisfaction, to what hath been already, and will be hereafter said, to evince the Necessity of such a Conduct, in other mo-

^a GEN. xxii. 16, 17.

mentous Points relating to that future Dispensation.

But it may be asked, perhaps, if such Revelations could not be *clearly* recorded, why were they recorded at all? For a very plain Reason, that when the Fulness of Time should come, they might rise up in Evidence against Infidelity, for the real Relation and Dependency between the two Dispensations of *Moses* and *Christ*; when from this, and divers the like Instances, it should appear, that the first Dispensation could be but very imperfectly understood without a necessary Reference to the latter.

But had not the sacred Writer designedly obscured this illustrious Revelation, by an Omission of the attendant Circumstances, yet the Narrative of such a *Converse by Action* was not, in its Nature, so intelligible or obvious, as that where God is shewn *conversing by Action* to the Prophets, in the several Instances formerly given^b. And the Reason is this, Those Informations, as they are given to the Prophets for the Instruction of the People, have necessarily, in the Course of the History, their Explanations annexed. But the Information to *Abraham* being solely for his own Use, there was no Room for that formal Explanation, which made the commanded Actions, performed by the Prophets, so clear and intelligible. But to shew by *Example*, as well as *Comparison*, that Obscurity is naturally attendant on the Relation of *Converse by Action*, where the Information is for the sake of the Actor only, I shall instance in a Case where no Obscurity was *affected* by the Historian. It is the Relation of *Jacob's wrestling with the Angel*^c. The Patriarch, on his Return from *Haran* to his native Country, hearing of his Brother *Esau's* Power, and dreading his Resentment for his defrauded Birthright, in this Distress, addresses himself, with all Humility and

^b See p. 81 to 96. ^c GEN. xxxii.

Confidence, to the *God of his Fathers* for Protection: GOD hears his Prayers, and is pleased to inform him of the happy Issue of this Adventure by a significative Action: The following Night he has a Struggle with an Angel, with whom he is suffered to make his Part so good, that from thence, and the Angel's departing Words, he collected GOD had granted his Petition. This is the Circumstance in *Jacob's* History that affords such Mirth to our illiterate Libertines: For this *Information by Action* concerning only the Actor, who little needed to be told the Meaning of a Mode of Instruction, at that Time in vulgar Use, has now an Obscurity, which the Scripture-Relations of the same Mode of Information to the Prophets are free from, by Reason of their being given for the Use of the People, to whom they were to be explained.

But it may perhaps be asked, why, when *the Fulness of Time was come*, Scripture did not break its long Silence, and instruct us in the principal and proper Reason of the *Command to offer Isaac*? We answer, that it has done so. The Words of *Jesus* are an illustrious Proof. Nay, we go farther, and say that this is not the only Place where the true Reason of the *Command* is plainly hinted at. The Author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, speaking of this very *Command*, says—*By Faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac—accounting that God was able to raise him up even from the Dead, from whence also he received him* IN A FIGURE^d; ΕΝ ΠΑΡΑΒΟΛΗ, in a Parable: A Mode of Information either by *Words* or *Actions*, which consists in putting one Thing for another. Now in a Writer, who regarded this commanded Action as a representative Information of the Redemption of Mankind, nothing could be more fine or easy than this Ex-

^d Chap. xi. § 17—19.

pression. For though *Abraham* did not indeed receive *Isaac* restored to Life after a real Dissolution, yet the Son being in this Action to represent CHRIST suffering Death for the Sins of the World, when the Father brought him safe from Mount *Moriab* after three Days, during which he was in the State of Condemnation to Death, he plainly received him under the Character of CHRIST's Representative, as restored from the Dead. For, as his coming to the Mount, and binding, and laying on the Altar figured the Sufferings and Death of CHRIST, so his being taken from thence alive as properly figured CHRIST's Resurrection from the Dead. With the highest Propriety, therefore, and Elegance of Speech might *Abraham* be said to receive *Isaac* from the Dead in a Parable, or in Representation. But the Nature of the Command being unknown, these Words, of the *Epistle*, have been hitherto understood to signify only that *Isaac* was a Type of Christ, in the same Sense that the Old Tabernacle, in this *Epistle*^e, is called a Type — ἡΤΙΣ ΠΑΡΑΒΟΛΗ, that is, a Thing designed by the Holy Spirit to have both a present Significancy and a future. Which amounts but just to this, That *Abraham* receiving *Isaac* safe from Mount *Moriab* in the Manner Scripture relates, he, thereby, became a Type. An ancient Interpretation, as appears by the reading of the vulgar Latin — *Unde eum & IN PARABOLAM accepit*, for in Parabola, as it ought to have been translated conformably to the Greek. However I desire it may be observed, in Corroboration of my Sense of the Command, that the Resemblance to Christ's Sacrifice, in all the Circumstances of the Story, was so strong, that Interpreters could never overlook that Resemblance, in their Comments on this Passage.

^e Chap. ix. v 9.

2. To the *second Part* of the Objection, I answer thus: It is the Office of History to assign the *Causes* of the *Facts* related. In those *Facts*, therefore, which have *several* *Causes*, of which the *Principal* cannot be conveniently told, the *Inferior* come in properly to take their Place. Thus, in the Case before us, though it be made, I presume, very evident that the *principal* Design of the *Command* was to reveal to *Abraham*, by Action instead of Words, the Redemption of Mankind; yet as this was a Favour of a very high Nature, and conferred on *Abraham* at his most earnest Request, it was but fit he should approve himself worthy of it by some proportionable Trial: agreeably to what we find in Scripture to be God's Way of dealing with his favoured Servants. On this Account, therefore, God was pleased, by the very Manner in which this Mystery was revealed, to tempt or try *Abraham*. Where the making the *Favour* itself the *Trial* of his deserving it, has all that superior Elegance and Beauty which is to be conceived in the Dispensations of Divine Wisdom only^f. Now, as the *principal* Reason of the *Command* could not be

^f The following Extract of a Letter is from the same eminent Hand with that in the long Note at p. 181, and admirably explains this Text in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*: "As this Point
 "[viz. the Interpretation of the Command to offer *Isaac*] is
 "a very material one — give me leave to suggest to you a very
 "old Thought of mine. I do it the rather as it appears to me
 "not inconsistent with your Scheme, and may perhaps, under
 "your Management, be improved to the Support of it. Many
 "Years ago I made two Sermons upon the Offering up of *Isaac*.
 "I was under a Difficulty to account for this Action on the foot
 "of its being a Trial only; not being able to account to my-
 "self for so very extraordinary a Case, without any Reason given
 "for it, excepting only this, that it shewed the Strength of
 "*Abraham's* Faith. I thought then there must be something
 "particular, some special Use of this Act of Faith. I saw
 "plainly that *Abraham's* Faith was proposed as a Pattern to

conveniently told by the Historian, this *inferior* one of the Trial is assigned with great Truth and Propriety — *And it came to pass after these Things God did tempt Abraham, and said, Take now thy Son, &c.* And it is to be observed, that the very Manner of recording this Reason shews it to be indeed what we suppose it, an *inferior* one. For it is not said that God gave this Command in order to try Abraham, which expresses a *principal* Reason, but that, *in giving the Command, God did try him*, which at most only implies an *inferior* one. We have said,

“ *Jews and Christians.* That the *Jews* were called on in the
 “ New Testament to submit to the Faith of the Gospel, in Imitation of *Abraham’s* Faith. Now the Gospel proposed an Act
 “ of Faith no where exemplified in the Old Testament, *i. e.*
 “ teaching to receive the Promises of Life and Salvation thro’
 “ a Person *dead*, and *raised* from the *Dead*. When the *Jews*
 “ were called on by the Apostles to imitate the Faith of *Abraham*,
 “ they might have said, *Abraham* trusted for great Things,
 “ indeed, but Things possible at least; — to inherit the promised Land; to have a numerous and prosperous Issue: — But
 “ you call on us to trust in a dead Man, to believe him raised,
 “ &c. — I saw plainly from the Story in *Genesis*, compared with
 “ the Passage in the *Hebrews*, that the Offering up *Isaac*, and
 “ his Deliverance, was as near a Representation of the Death
 “ and Resurrection of *JESUS* as could be; for a Representation
 “ or Figure must not be the very Thing itself: I saw from the
 “ Passage in the *Hebrews*, that the Strength and Merit of *Abraham’s* Faith lay in this, that having received the Promise,
 “ *That in ISAAC shall thy Seed be called*, he doubted not of
 “ *GOD’s* fulfilling *this* Promise to him, even when he was going
 “ to slay *this* Son; reconciling the Contradiction by that eminent Act of Faith, *accounting that God was able to raise him*
 “ *even from the dead*. Did not this last Act complete the Faith
 “ of *Abraham*, and come up to be a Pattern of the Faith required in *CHRIST* crucified? If so, it shews why the Trial was
 “ made — Why it was the last Trial — for it rendered *Abraham’s* Faith complete, and had respect to the great End of all
 “ the Promises; and when this was over, *Abraham’s* Task was
 “ finished, and his Faith made a perfect Example to those, who
 “ were, in the Fulness of Time, to be called to like Faith.”
 Thus far this admirable Writer. And, in my humble Opinion

that

that a *Trial*, when answered to, implied a following Reward. Now as there may be more Reasons than one for giving a Command, so there may be more Rewards than one attendant on a Trial. Thus it was in the Case before us. And it is remarkable, that the sacred Historian has observed the same Rule with regard to the *Reward* of the Trial as to the *Reason* of the Command. The principal and peculiar Reward of *Abraham's* Trial here was the Revelation of the Mystery of Redemption: this the Historian could not mention, for the Reasons

nothing can be more solid or important than these Observations, which he hath done me the Honour to communicate to me. In all God's *particular* Revelations there are two Uses: the one regarding the Person favoured with the Revelation, the other Mankind in general. I presume my Account of the Command to offer *Isaac* hath well explained the Case of *Abraham*, and cleared up all the Difficulties with which it was embarrassed: And it is certain this illustrious Writer's Account of *Abraham's* Trial hath shewn the great Use of it in the Establishment of *Christianity*. But could it have been urged with its last and fullest Force by the Apostolic Writers, without taking in the Idea which my Interpretation of *Abraham's* Case supplies us with? I think not. According to the way this excellent Person shews us, that *Abraham's Faith* was proposed, by the Apostles, as a Pattern to Jews and Christians, it was the Faith of a Man, who received the Promises of Life and Salvation, through a Person dead and raised from the Dead. This was the highest Resemblance the Pattern could be seen in; on the common Interpretation; on ours, it was the very Thing itself. It was the Faith of one who received the Promises of Life and Salvation through *JESUS* dead, and raised from the Dead: so that the Jews were called, by the Example of *Abraham*, to embrace that very Faith which had rendered *Abraham* so meritorious. For tho' it might prejudice the Jews in Favour of the Gospel, to shew them that they were called to no Act of Faith, but such as their Father *Abraham* had exercised, yet the more effectual Means of Conversion to that Faith in *JESUS* was the very Religion of their Father *Abraham*, who rejoiced to see *CHRIST's* Day, and saw it, and was glad. Thus it would seem that the Observations of this illustrious Writer are not only very consistent with our Interpretation, but do greatly support it, and cannot themselves be urged in their full Force without it.

Christianity, was to shew them

given

given above: but besides this, God rewarded him with a Repetition of all the former Promises. This the Historian *could*, and, in pursuance of the Rules of History, *does* mention: *By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for because thou hast done this Thing, and hast not withheld thy Son, thine only Son, that in Blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying, I will multiply thy Seed as the Stars of Heaven, and as the Sand which is upon the Sea-shore; and thy Seed shall possess the Gate of his Enemies; and in thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be blessed, because thou hast obeyed my Voice*^f.

On the whole, this Objection, the only one I think can be made to our Interpretation, is so far from weakening, that it adds great Light and Strength to it. For admitting our Sense to be indeed the true, we see the Story must, of Necessity, have been told in the very Manner we find it recorded.

Before I conclude this Part of the Discourse, I shall but just take notice how strongly *this Interpretation* of the Command concludes against the SOCINIANS, for the *real Sacrifice* of CHRIST, and the *proper Redemption* of Mankind. For if the Command was an Information by *Action* instead of Words, the Proposition conveyed in it is decisive; there being here no Room for their Evasion of a *figurative Expression*, where the *figurative Action*, the Original of all *such* Expression, denotes either a *real Sacrifice*, or nothing at all.

II.

I come now to the other Part of this Discourse, to shew, that the Interpretation here given intirely dissipates all those blustering Objections which Infidelity hath raised against the historic Truth of the Relation.

^f Chap. xxii. v 16, & seq.

They say, GOD could never give such a Command to *Abraham*, because it would throw him into inextricable Doubts concerning the Author of it, as whether it proceeded from a good or evil Being. Or if not so, but that he could persuade himself it came from GOD, it would then mislead him in his Notions of the divine Attributes, and of the fundamental Principles of Morality. Because though the revoking the Command prevented the Homicide, yet the Action being commanded, and, at the Revocation, not condemned, *Abraham* and his Family must needs have thought human Sacrifices grateful to the Almighty. For a simple Revoking was no Condemnation; but would be more naturally esteemed a *peculiar* Indulgence for a ready Obedience. Thus, the Pagan Fable of *Diana's* substituting a Hind in the Place of *Iphigenia* did not make Idolaters believe that she therefore abhorred human Sacrifices, they having been before persuaded of the contrary.—This is the whole Substance, only set in a *clearer* Light, of all their dull cloudy Dissertations on the *Case of Abraham*.

1. Let us see then how his *Case* stood: GOD had been pleased to reveal to him his eternal Purpose of making all mankind blessed thro' him; and to confirm this Promise, in a regular Course of successive Revelations, each fuller and more explicate than the other. By this Time the *Father of the Faithful*, as we must needs suppose, from the Nature of the Thing, would be grown very desirous of knowing the Manner how this Blessing was to be brought about: A Mystery, if we will believe the Author of our Faith, that engaged the Attention of other holy Men, less concerned than *Abraham*, and consequently, less stimulated and excited by their Curiosity: — *And JESUS turned to his Disciples, and said privately, Blessed are the Eyes which see the Things which*

which ye see. For I tell you that many Prophets and Kings have DESIRED to see those Things which ye see, and have not seen them, and to hear those Things which ye hear, and have not heard them^g. But we are assured, by the same Authority, that Abraham had, in fact, this very Desire highly raised in him: Abraham rejoiced to see my Day (says JESUS) and he saw it, and was glad; or rather, He rejoiced THAT HE MIGHT SEE, INA IDH; which implies, that the Period of this Joy was in the Space between the Promise that the Favour should be conferred, and the actual conferring it, in the Delivery of the Command; consequently, that it was granted at his earnest Request^h. In the second Place we shall prove from the same Words, that Abraham, at the Time the Command was given, KNEW it to be this Revelation granted at his earnest Request: — Your Father Abraham rejoiced to see my Day, and he saw it, and was glad. Ἀβραάμ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἠγαλλιάσατο INA IDH: ἥ ἡμέραν ἥ ἐμὴν καὶ εἶδε, καὶ ἐχάρη. We have observed that ἵνα ἴδῃ in strict Propriety, signifies *that he might see*. The English Phrase, — *to see* is equivocal and ambiguous, and means either the present Time, *that he did then see*; or the future, *that he was promised he should see*: but the Original ἵνα ἴδῃ has only the latter Sense. So that the Text plainly distinguishes two different Periods of Joy; the first, when *it was promised he should see*; the second, when *he actually saw*: And it is to be observed, that, in the exact Use of the Words, ἀγαλλιάσθαι signifies that tumultuous Pleasure which the certain Expectation of an approaching Blessing, understood only in the gross, occasions; and χαίρειν that calm and settled Joy that arises from our Know-

^g LUKE X. 23, 24.

^h Thus all the Eastern Versions understand it: Syr. Cupidus fuit videndi. — Pers. Cupidus erat ut videret. — Arab. Exoptavit videre. — Æthiop. Desideravit, gavisus est ut videret.

ledge, in the Possession of it: But the Translators, perhaps, not apprehending there was any Time between the *Grant to see*, and the *seeing*, turned it, he *rejoiced to see*; as if it had been the Paraphrase of the Poet *Nonnus*,

ιδεῖν ἠγάλλετο θυμῷ.

whereas this History of *Abraham* has plainly three distinct Periods: The *first* contains God's Promise to grant his Request, when *Abraham rejoiced that he should see*; this, for Reasons given above, was wisely omitted by the Historian: Within the *second*, was the Delivery of the *Command*, with which *Moses's* Account begins: And *Abraham's* Obedience, thro' which he *saw CHRIST's Day and was glad*, includes the *third*. Thus the Patriarch, we find, had a Promise that his Request should be granted; and, in pursuance of that Promise, an Action is commanded, which, at that Time, was a common Mode of Information; he must needs therefore know it to be the very Information so much requested, so graciously promised, and so impatiently expected. We conclude therefore, on the whole, that this Command being only the Grant of an earnest Request, and known by *Abraham* at the Time of imposing, to be such Grant, he could not possibly have any *Doubt* concerning the *Author* of it. He was soliciting the God of Heaven to reveal to him the Mystery of Man's Redemption, and he receives this *Revelation* in a Command to offer *Isaac*; a Revelation that had the closest Connection with, and was the fullest Completion of the whole Series of the preceding.

2. For, as we come now to shew, in Answer to the second Part of the Objection, the *Command* could occasion no *Mistakes* concerning the Divine Attributes; it was, as we have proved, only the Conveyance of an Information by *Action* instead of
Words,

Words, in Conformity to the common Mode of conversing in early Times. This Action therefore being mere *Scenery*, and, like *Words*, only of *arbitrary* Signification, it had NO MORAL IMPORT; That is, it conveys or implies none of those Intentions in the Prescriber, which go along with Actions that have a *moral Import*. Consequently the Injunction of such an Action as hath it not, can no Way affect the moral Character of the Person commandingⁱ: and consequently this Command could occasion no Mistakes concerning the Divine Attributes with regard to God's delighting in hu-

ⁱ This shews why God might say to *Hosea*, *Go take unto thee a Wife of Whoredoms*, &c. Chap. i. v. 2. Tho' all Actions which have no *moral Import* are indifferent; yet some of this Kind (which would even be indifferent, had they a *moral Import*) may, on the very Account of their having no *moral Import*, be the Object of Pleasure or Displeasure. Thus, in the Adventure between *Elisha* and *Joash*, we are told, that the Prophet said unto the King, "Take Bow and Arrows; and he
" took unto him Bow and Arrows. And he said to the King
" of *Israel*, Put thine Hand upon the Bow; and he put his
" Hand upon it; and *Elisha* put his Hands upon the King's
" Hands. And he said, Open the Window eastward; and he
" opened it. Then *Elisha* said, Shoot; and he shot. And he
" said, The Arrow of the Lord's Deliverance from *Syria*: for
" thou shalt smite the *Syrians* in *Aphek*, till thou have consumed
" them. And he said, Take the Arrows; and he took them.
" And he said unto the King of *Israel*, Smite upon the Ground;
" and he smote thrice and layed. And the *Man of God* was
" wroth with him, and said, Thou shouldest have smitten five or
" six Times, then hadst thou smitten *Syria*, till thou hadst consumed them, whereas now thou shalt smite *Syria* but thrice." 2 KINGS xiii. 15,—18. Here it is not difficult to apprehend that the Prophet, by God's Command, directed the King to perform a significative Action, whose Meaning God had beforehand explained to his Messenger: And, amongst the Particulars of it had told him this, that the *Syrians* should be smitten as often as the King smote upon the Ground when the Prophet should order him, only in general Words, *to smite* it. Hence the Prophet's Anger, occasioned by his Love to his Country, on the King's stopping when he had smote thrice.

man Sacrifices. On the contrary, the very Information conveyed by it, was the highest Assurance to the Person informed, of *God's Good-will towards Mankind*. Hence we see there was not the least Occasion, when God *remitted* the Offering of *Isaac*, that he should *formally condemn* human Sacrifices, to prevent *Abraham* or his Family's falling into an Opinion, that such Sacrifices were not displeasing to him, no more than for the Prophet *Abijah*^k, when he had rent *Jeroboam's* Garment into twelve Pieces to denote the ensuing Division in the Tribes of *Israel*, to deliver a moral Precept against the Sinfulness of pulling our Neighbours Clothes off their Backs: For the Command having, as we said, *no moral Import*, being only an Information by Action, where one Thing stood for the Representative of another, all the Consequence that could be deduced from it was only this, that the Son of God should be offered up for the Sins of Mankind: therefore the Conceptions they had of human Sacrifices, after the *Command*, must needs be just the same with that they had before; and therefore Instruction concerning the execrable Nature of human Sacrifices was not only needless, but quite beside the Question.

3. And now we see the Weakness of the third and last Part of the Objection, which supposes this

^k “ And it came to pass at that Time, when *Jeroboam* went
 “ out of *Jerusalem*, that the Prophet *Abijah* the *Shilonite* found
 “ him in the Way; and he had clad himself with a *new Gar-*
 “ *ment*, and they two were alone in the Field. And *Abijah*
 “ caught the *new Garment* that was on him, and rent it in
 “ twelve Pieces, and he said to *Jeroboam*, Take thee ten Pieces,
 “ for thus saith the Lord the God of *Israel*, Behold I will rend
 “ the Kingdom out of the Hand of *Solomon*, and will give ten
 “ Tribes to thee.” 1 KINGS xi. 29. The Circumstance of the
new Garment was not insignificant: It was to denote the Power
 of the Kingdom at that Time in its full Strength and Lustre.

Com-

Command capable of affording a Temptation to transgress any fundamental Principle of the Law of Nature: One of which obliges us to cherish and protect our Offspring; and another to forbear the injuring our Neighbour. For as, by the Command, *Abraham* understood the Nature of Man's Redemption; so, by the Nature of that Redemption, he must know how the scenical Representation was to end. *Isaac*, he saw, was made the *Person* or Representative of *Christ dying for us*: The Son of God, he knew, could not possibly lie under the *Dominion of the Grave*. Hence he must needs conclude one of these two Things, either that God would stop his Hand when he came to give the sacrificing Stroke: or that, if the Revelation of this Mystery was to be represented throughout in Action, that then his Son, sacrificed in the Person of **CHRIST**, was immediately to be restored to Life: *Accounting* (as he well might) *that God was able to raise him up even from the Dead*, as the Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*¹, who seems to have been full of the Idea here explained, assures us he did believe.

Now where was the Temptation to violate any Principle of Morality in all this? The Law of Nature commands him to cherish and protect his Offspring. Was that transgressed in giving a Stroke whose Hurt was instantaneously to be repaired? Surely no more than if the Stroke had been in Vision. The Law of Nature forbids all Injury to his Fellow-creature. And was he injured, who, by being thus highly honoured in becoming the Representative of the Son of God, was to share with *Abraham* in the Rewards of his Obedience? But though, as we see, *Abraham* could have no Struggles with himself from any Doubts that he violated Mo-

¹ Chap. xi. § 19.

rality in paying Obedience to the Command; yet did the Merit of that Obedience deserve all the Encomiums given to it in holy Writ. For, in expressing his extreme Readiness to obey, he declared a full Confidence in the Promises of God.

From hence we may deduce these two Corollaries,

1. That the noble *Author of the Characteristics* has shewn as much Ignorance as Malevolence, when he supposed that *Abraham's* shewing no *extreme Surprise on this trying Revelation* was from the favourable Notion he had of human Sacrifices, *so common amongst the Inhabitants of the Palestine and other neighbouring Nations*^m. For we see the Reason, why *Abraham*, instead of being under an *extreme Surprise*, was (as *JESUS* assures us) under an *extreme Joy*, was because he understood the *Command* to be a Communication of that *Mystery* which he had so earnestly requested to be informed of. And, consequently, that *Isaac* must needs, at length, come safe and unhurt from that scenical Representation, in which he bore the chiefest Part.

^m “ To me (says the noble Writer) it plainly appears, that
 “ in the early Times of *all* Religions, when Nations were yet
 “ barbarous and savage, there was ever an Aptness or Tendency
 “ towards the dark Part of Superstition, which amongst many
 “ other Horrors produced that of *human Sacrifice*. Something
 “ of this Nature might possibly be deduced even from holy
 “ Writ.” — To this a Note refers in the following Words —
 GEN. xxii. 1. and JUDG. xi. 30. *These Places relating to Abraham and Jephthah are cited only with respect to the Notion which these primitive Warriors may be said to have entertained concerning this horrid Enormity, so common amongst the Inhabitants of the Palestine and other neighbouring Nations. It appears that even the elder of these Hebrew Princes was under no extreme Surprise on this trying Revelation. Nor did he think of expostulating, in the least, on this Occasion; when at another Time he could be so importunate for the Pardon of an inhospitable, murderous, impious, and incestuous City; GEN. xviii. 23, &c. Charact. vol. iii. p. 124.*

2. — That

2. — That Sir John Marsham's Suspicion of *Abraham's* being struck by a superstitious Imaginationⁿ is utterly false, and highly injurious to the holy Patriarch. Nay his own Instances might have shewn him the Weakness of such Insinuations: For, according to them, human Sacrifices were never offered but in Cases of great Distress: Now *Abraham* was, at this Time, in a State of perfect Peace and Affluence.

Thus, we presume, it appears that this *Command* was a mere *Information by Action*: and that, when regarded in this View, all the Arguments against God's giving it to *Abraham* are quite enervated and overthrown.

I. But now as I am no Stranger either to our Adversaries Talents or Temper, I question not but they would be ready to object,

That the giving a Solution of a Difficulty in the *Old Testament* by the Assistance of the *New*, considered together, as making up one *intire* Dispensation, is an unfair Way of arguing against an *Unbeliever*: who supposing both the *Jewish* and *Christian* Religions *false*, of consequence supposes them *independent* on one another; and that this pretended *Relation* was a Contrivance of the Authors of the later Imposture to give it Strength, by taking Root in an old flourishing Superstition. Therefore, will they say, if we would argue successfully against them, we must seek a Solution of their Difficulties

ⁿ — *Ex istis satius est colligere hanc Abrahami tentationem non fuisse κεναιρα ενδρασην παροξεν, actionem innovatam; non recens excogitatam, sed ad pristinos Cananæorum mores designatam. Horrendi sacrificii usum apud Phœnices frequentem indicat Porphyrius: "Phœnices, inquit, in magnis periculis ex bello, fame, pestilentia, charissimorum aliquem ad id suffragiis publicis delectum, sacrificabant Saturno. Et victimarum talium plena est Sanchuniathonis historia Phœnicice scripta, quam Philo Biblius Græce interpretatus est libris octo." Canon. Chron. p. 79.*

in that Religion alone, from which they arise. — Thus I will suppose them to argue. And I apprehend they will have no Reason^o, for this Time at least, to say I have put worse Arguments into their Mouths than they are accustomed to employ against us.

I reply then, that it will admit of no Dispute, but that if they may have the Liberty of inventing two *Chimeras*, and of calling one *Judaism*, and the other *Christianity*, they will have a very easy Victory over both. This is an old Trick, and has been often tried with Success. By this slight Conveyance, TYNDAL has juggled idle Starers out of their Religion. For, in a famous Book written against Revelation, he lays it down as a Principle, *that Christianity is ONLY a Republication of the Religion of Nature*: The Consequence of which is, that *this* and *Judaism* are *independent* Institutions. But sure the Deist is not to obtrude his own *Inventions* for those Religions he endeavours to overthrow. Much less is he to *beg the Question* of their Falsity; as the laying it down that the *Jewish* and *Christian* are two independent Religions, certainly is: because *Christianity* claims its Titles of Divinity from and under *Judaism* — If therefore *Deists* will not, yet *Christians* must, of Necessity, take their Religion as they find it. And if they will remove infidel Objections to either Religion, they must reason on

° The noble Author of the *Characteristics* arraigning Divines for their Unfairness in representing the Arguments of their Adversaries, after a great deal of Mirth with *Philotheus* and *Philatheus*, *Philautus* and *Philalethes*, the very legitimate and obsequious Puppets (as he calls them) of the Author, goes on in this Manner: — *After the poor Phantom or Shadow of an Adversary has said as little for his Cause as can be imagined, and given as many Opens and Advantages as could be desired, he lies down for good and all, and passively submits to the killing Strokes of his unmerciful Conqueror.* Vol. iii. p. 293.

the

the Principle of *Dependency*. And while they do so, their Reasonings will not only be just and logical, but every Solution, on such a Principle, will, besides its Determination on the particular Point in question, be a new Proof of the Divinity of both in general; because such a Relation, Connexion, and Dependency between two Religions of so distant Periods, could not possibly come about but by divine Prevision. For a Deist, therefore, to bid us remove his Objections on the Principle of *Independency*, is to bid us prove our Religion *true* on a Principle that implies its *Falshood*; the *New Testament* giving us no other Idea of *Christianity* than as of a Religion dependent on, connected with, and the Completion of *Judaism*.

But suppose us now in this Excess of Complaisance for our Adversaries; and then see whether the *Ingenuity* of their Acceptance would not equal the *Reasonableness* of their Demand. Without doubt, were we once, *generally*, so foolish as to swallow these Chimeras of theirs, we should have them amongst the first to cry out against the Prevarication. I speak not this by guess: the Fact has already happened. Certain Advocates of Religion, unable to reconcile the *Application* of some *Old Testament* Prophecies, as made by the Writers of the *New*, to their Notions of Logic and Philosophy, thought it best to throw aside the Care of *Jewish* Religion, as a Burden, which neither they nor their Fathers could bear, and address themselves to the Support of the *Christian*, by proving its Divinity independently, and from itself alone. Upon this COLLINS (for I have chose to instance in these two first-rate Traders in Free-thinking, the Small craft vanishing as fast as they appear: For who now talks of *Blount* or *Coward*; or who hereafter will talk of *Strutt* or *Morgan*^a?) that the World may see how

^a Not the old *British Morgan*, better known by the Name of *Pelagius*; but a mere Modern so called. Honest *Gildas* brands the first of the Name with the Title of *Ætatis Atramentum*, *The Ink of the Age*: And indeed he wrote in lasting Characters; and had Parts and Learning. But the Man here meant has neither; and therefore may be more truly styled, *The BLACK LEAD*

little they agreed about their Principles, or rather how little Regard they paid to any Principles at all: *Collins*, I say, wrote a Book to exclaim against their ill Faith; and to remind them of, and to prove to them the inseparable Connexion between the *Old* and *New* Testament. This was a fair hit, and proved a seasonable Reproof for so egregious a Folly. But then let not our Adversaries go back again, and chicaned with us, for calling in the Assistance of the *New Testament* to repulse their Attacks upon the *Old*, while at the same time they think themselves at Liberty to use the Assistance of the *Old* to help them to overthrow the *New*. Let us but uniformly hold the inseparable Connexion between both; and then let them, if they will, as they fairly may, take all the Advantages they suppose they have against us, from the Necessity we lie under of so doing.

In a word, we give them *Judaism* and *Christianity* as equally true Religions, with that mutual Dependence on one another, which arises from one's being the Completion of the other. They have it in their Choice to oppose our Pretensions, either by disputing with us that Dependency, or raising Difficulties on the foot of it. But while they only *suppose* it visionary; and then argue against each Religion on that *Supposition*, they only beg the Question. And while they do that, we are in Order, and within all the Rules of good Logic, when we remove their Objections on that Principle of *Dependency* laid down in Scripture.

This necessary Rule of Interpretation being however still observed, that in explaining any Difficulty in the *Old Testament*, we never, on Pretence of such *Dependency*, forsake the Genius and Manners of the Times in question, and serve ourselves of those of the later *Christian* Period, as *Collins* (whether

of the Age; which whoever will venture the dirtying his Fingers may wipe out at Pleasure. He hath, I hear, lately wrote against *The Divine Legation of Moses*, under the Name of a *Society of Free-thinkers*, by the same kind of Figure that He in the *Gospel* called himself *Legion*, who was only the forwardest Devil in the Crew.

truly or no, let them look to, who are concerned in it) upbraids some Defenders of Christianity for doing. This *necessary* Rule is here, I presume, observed with much Exactness; the Foundation of my Interpretation of the *Command* being that ancient Mode of Converse, so much, at that Time, in Use, of *conversing by Actions*.

II. But my Adversaries are not yet silenced; I see them ready to object, that I fly to the old exploded Refuge of a *TYPE*, which the great Author of *the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion* has shewn to be visionary and senseless; the mere illogical Whimfies of cabalistic *Jews*. To this I answer,

1. *That they are mistaken.* This Interpretation is not founded in any *typical* Sense whatsoever; the *Person of Isaac* on the Mount being no more a *Type* of *Christ* than the five Letters that compose his Name are a *Type* of him; but only an arbitrary Mark to stand for the Idea of *Christ*, as that Word does. So that their Cry against *Types*, let it be with what Force it will, does not at all affect this Interpretation.

2. But secondly, I say, a *Type* is neither visionary, nor senseless, as much Disgrace as this Mode of Information has suffered by the mad Abuse of Fanaticism and Superstition; but a just and reasonable Manner of denoting one Thing by another: Not the Creature of the Imagination, made out of nothing, to serve a Turn, as these Men represent it; but as natural and apposite a *Figure* as any used in human Converse. Which appears from hence, that *Types* arose from that original Mode of Communication, *conversing by Actions*: their Difference being only this, that, where the Action is *simply significative*, it has *no moral Import*; where it has a *moral Import*, it is *Typical*. For Example, when
Ezekiel

Ezekiel is bid to *shave his Beard, to weigh the Hair in Balances, to divide it into three Parts, to burn one, to strike another with a Knife, and to scatter the third Part in the Wind*^p, this Action having *no moral Import* is merely *significative* of Information given. But when the *Israelites* are commanded to take a *male Lamb without Blemish, and the whole Assembly of the Congregation to kill it, and to sprinkle the Blood upon the Door-posts*^q, this Action having a *moral Import* as being a religious *Rite*, and, at the same Time, representative of something future, is properly *Typical*. Hence arose the Mistake of the Interpreters of the *Command* to offer *Isaac*. For supposing the Action commanded to have a *moral Import*, as being only for a *Trial* of *Abraham's Faith*, and, at the same Time, seeing in it the most exact Resemblance of the Death of *CHRIST*, they very wrongly concluded that Action to be *Typical* which was merely *significative*. And by that Means, leaving in the Action a *moral Import*, subjected it to all those Cavils of Infidelity, which, by taking away that *moral Import*, which really belongs not to it; we have entirely overthrown.

But it being of the highest Importance to Revelation in general, and not a little conducive to the Support of our Arguments for the *Divine Legation of Moses in particular*, to shew the Logical Truth and Propriety of *Types in Action, and secondary Senses in Speech*, I shall take this Opportunity to examine the Matter to the Bottom. For having occasionally shewn, in several Parts of the preceding Discourse, that the References in the *Old Law* to the *Christian Dispensation* (of which we hold it to be the Foundation and Preparative) are in *typical Representations, and secondary Senses*; and the

^p *EZEK. v.* ^q *EXOD. xii. 5, 6, 7.*

Truth of Christianity depending on the *real Relations* (which are to be discovered by such *References*) between the two Dispensations, it will be incumbent on me to prove the Logical Truth and Propriety of *Types* in Action, and *secondary* Senses in Speech.

And I enter on the Subject with the greater Pleasure, as one of the most plausible Books ever wrote against *Christianity* is intirely levelled at them. In this Enquiry I shall pursue the same Method I have hitherto taken with Infidel Writers; examine only the Grounds and Principles on which they go, and having removed and overthrown them, in as few Words as I am able, leave the Superstructure to support itself as it may.

S E C T. VI.

THE Book I speak of, is intitled, *A Discourse of the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion*, written, as is generally supposed, by Mr. Collins; a Writer, whose *Dexterity in the Arts of Controversy* was so remarkably contrasted by his *Abilities in Reasoning and Literature*, as to be ever putting one in mind of what Travellers tell us of the Genius of the *proper Indians*, who, altho' the veriest Bunglers in the fine Arts of *manual Operation*, yet excel all Mankind in every Slight and Trick of *Legerdemain*.

The Purpose of his Book is to prove JESUS an Impostor; and his grand Argument stands thus,—JESUS (as he shews) claims under the promised Messiah of the *Jews*, and so proposes himself as the Deliverer prophesied of in their sacred Books; yet (as he attempts to shew) none of those Prophecies can be understood of JESUS but in a *secondary Sense* only; now a *secondary Sense* (as he pretends) is fanatical, chimerical, and contrary to all scholastic Rules

Rules of Interpretation ; consequently JESUS not being prophesied of in the *Jewish* Writings, his Pretensions are false and groundless. — His Conclusion, the Reader sees, stands on the *joint* Support of these two Propositions, *That there is no Jewish Prophecy which relates to JESUS in a primary Sense ; and That a secondary Sense is enthusiastical and unscholastic.* If either fail, this Phantom of a Conclusion sinks again into its original Nothing.

Tho' I shall not omit occasionally to confute the *first*, yet it is the Falshood of the *second* I am principally concerned to expose. — That there are *Jewish* Prophecies which relate to JESUS in their direct and primary Sense, has been proved by an excellent Prelate^r with great Force of Reason and Learning ; but, that *secondary* Prophecies are not enthusiastical and unscholastic, has not been shewn and insisted on by the Writers on this Question with the same Advantage. The Truth is, the *Nature* of a *double Sense* in Prophecies has been so little seen or enquired into, that even some *Divines* who agree in nothing else, have agreed to second this Assertion of Mr. Collins, and with the same Frankness and Confidence to pronounce that a *double Sense* is enthusiastical and unscholastic. To put a Stop therefore to this growing Evil, so fatal to Revelation, is not amongst the last Purposes of the following Discourse.

I. It hath been shewn^s, that one of the most ancient and simple Modes of human Converse was communicating the Conceptions by an expressive ACTION. As this was of familiar Use in *civil* Matters, it was natural to carry it into *religious*. Hence it is we see^t God delivering his Instructions to the Pro-

^r See *The Defence of Christianity from the Prophecies of the Old Testament*, and the *Vindication of the Defence*.

^s p. 81, & seq.

^t p. 38. & seq.

phet, and the Prophet God's Commands to the *People* in this very Manner: Thus far the Nature of the *Action*, both in *civil* and *religious* Matters, is exactly the same.

But in *Religion* it sometimes happens that a *STANDING* Information is necessary, and there the *Action* must be continually repeated: This is done by holding out the Truth (thus to be preserved) in a *religious Rite*. Here then the *Action* begins to change its Nature; and, from a mere significative Mark, of only *arbitrary Import*, like *Words* or *Letters*, becomes an *Action of moral Import*, and so acquires the new specific Name of *TYPE*. Thus God, intending to *record* the future Sacrifice of *CHRIST* in *Action*, did it by the periodic Sacrifice of a *Lamb without Blemish*. This was not *merely significative* of *CHRIST*, which any other expressive *Action* might have been, but was likewise a *Type* of him; because that Sacrifice being a *religious Rite*, it had a *moral Import*, under the *Jewish Dispensation*.

Again, It hath been shewn^v how, in the gradual Cultivation of Speech, the Expression by *Action* was improved and refined into an *ALLEGORY* or *Parable*; in which the Words carry a double Meaning; having, besides their obvious Sense that serves only for the *Envelope*, a more material and secret one. With this Figure of Speech all the moral Writings of Antiquity abound. But when it is transferred, from *civil* Use into *religious*, and employed in the Writings of inspired Men, to convey Information of particular Circumstances, in two distinct Dispensations, to a People who had an equal Concern in both, it is then what we call a *DOUBLE SENSE*; and undergoes the very same Change of Nature with an *expressive Action* converted into a

^v p. 143, 144.

Type; that is, *both* the Meanings in the *double Sense* are of *moral Import*; whereas in the *Allegory* *one* only is so: And *this*, which arises out of the very Nature of their Conversion, from *civil* to *religious* Matters, is the only Difference between *expressive Actions* and *Types*, and between *Allegories* and *double Senses*.

From hence it evidently appears, that as *Types* are only religious *expressive Actions*, and *double Senses* only religious *Allegories*, and receive no Change but what the very Manner of bringing those *civil Figures* into *Religion* necessarily induces, they must needs have, in this their *translative* State, the same logical Fitness they had in their *native*^w. Therefore as *expressive Actions* and *Allegories*, in *civil* Discourses are esteemed proper and reasonable Modes of Information, so must *Types* and *double Senses* in *religious*; for the End of both is the same, namely, Communication of Knowledge. The Consequence of this is, that our Author's Proposition, — *a secondary or double Sense is enthusiastical and unscholastic*, the necessary Support of his grand Argument, is entirely overthrown.

^w Hence we see the Vanity of that Distinction of Mr. *Whiston*, who is for retaining *Types* (necessitated thereto by the express Declarations of Holy Writ) and rejecting *double Senses*. "He [Mr *Whiston*] (says the Author of *the Grounds*, &c.) "justifies
 "typical arguing from the ritual Laws of Moses, and from *Pas-*
 "sages of History in the Old Testament. — Indeed he pretends *this*
 "last to be quite another Thing from the odd (typical) Application
 "of Prophecies. For (says he) the ancient ceremonial Institu-
 "tions were, as to their principal Branches, at least in their own
 "Nature, Types and Shadows of future good Things — But
 "the Case of the ancient Prophecies to be alledged from the old
 "Scriptures for the Confirmation of Christianity is quite of another
 "Nature, and of a more nice and exact Consideration," p. 227,
 228. It appears, indeed, they are of a more nice and exact Con-
 sideration, even from Mr. *Whiston*'s own so much mistaking them,
 as to suppose they are of a Nature quite different from *Types*.

This

This is the true and simple Origin of *Types* and *double Senses*; which our Adversaries, thro' Ignorance of the Rise and Progress of Speech, and for want of knowing ancient Manners, have insolently treated as the mere Issue of the distempered Brain of Visionaries and Enthusiasts.

II. Having thus shewn their *logical Propriety*, or that they are rational Modes of Information, I come now to vindicate their *religious Use*, and to shew that they are well suited to that Religion in which we find them employed. — An Objection which, I conceive, may be made to this Use, will lead us naturally into our Argument. The Objection is this: — I have shewn^x, that these oblique Modes of Converse, tho' at first invented out of *Necessity*, for general Information, were employed, at length, in a *mysterious Secrecion* of Knowledge; which, tho' it might be expedient, useful, and even necessary both in *civil Matters* and in *false Religion*, could never be so in the *true*; for *true Religion* having nothing to hide from any of its Followers, *Types* and *double Senses* (the same *mysterious* Conveyance of Knowledge in *sacred Matters* which *allegorical Words* or *Actions* are in *civil*) were altogether unfit to be employed in it.

To this I answer, — the *Jewish Religion*, in which these *Types* and *secondary Senses*, we say, are found, was given to one single People only, as the *Christian* is offered to all Mankind: Now the *Christian*, as our Adversary^y himself labours to prove,

^x p. 144, & seq.

^y “ *Christianity* is founded on *Judaism*, and the New Testament on the Old; and JESUS is the Person said in the New Testament to be promised in the Old, under the Character of the MESSIAH of the *Jews*, who, as such, only claims the Obedience and Submission of the World. Accordingly it is the Design of the Authors of the *New*, to prove all the Parts of *Christianity* from the Old Testament, which is said to con-

professes to be grounded on the *Jewish*. If therefore *Christianity* was not only *professedly*, but *really* grounded on *Judaism* (and the Supposition is strictly logical in a Defence of *Types* and *double Senses*, whose Reality depends on the Reality of that Relation) then *Judaism* was *preparatory* to *Christianity*, and *Christianity* the *ultimate End* of *Judaism*: But it is not to be supposed that there should be an intire *Silence* concerning this *ultimate* Religion during the *preparatory*, when the *Notice* of it was not only highly natural but expedient: 1. First, to draw those under the *preparatory* Religion, by just Degrees to the *ultimate*; a Provision the more necessary, as the Nature and Genius of the two Religions were different, the one *carnal*, the other *spiritual*. 2. Secondly, to afford convincing Evidence to future Ages of the Truth of that *ultimate* Religion; which Evidence a circumstantial Prediction of its Appearance and Nature so long beforehand effectually does afford. The *ultimate* Religion then must have been *noticed* in the *preparatory*.

Our next Inquiry will be, In what Manner this Notice must needs be given. Now the Nature of the Thing informs us it could not be *directly* and *openly*; so as to be understood by the People *at the Time of giving*. Because this would have defeated God's *intermediate* Purpose; which was to train them, by a long Discipline, under his *preparatory* Dispensation. But that being a Religion founded only on *temporal Sanctions*, and burdened with a *minute and tiresome Ritual*, had the People known

“tain the Words of eternal Life, and to represent JESUS and his
 “Apostles as fulfilling, by their Mission, Doctrines, and Works,
 “the Predictions of the Prophets, the historical Parts of the Old
 “Testament, and the *Jewish Law*; which last is expressly said
 “to prophesy of, or typify *Christianity*.” *Grounds and Reasons*,
 &c. p. 4, 5.

it to be only *preparatory* to another, founded on *better Promises* and easier Observances, they would never have born the Yoke of the Law, but have shaken off their Subjection to *Moses* before the *Fulness of Time* had brought their *spiritual Deliverer* amongst them; as, without this Knowledge, they were but too apt to do, on every imaginary Prospect of Advantage. This Information, therefore, was to be delivered with Caution; and conveyed under the Cover of their present Oeconomy. Hence arose the fit and necessary Use of TYPES and SECONDARY SENSES. For the only two safe and lasting Means of Conveyance were their *public Ritual*, and the *Writings of the Prophets*. And a *speaking Action*, and an *Allegory*, when thus stationed, had all the Secrecy that the Occasion required. We have observed, that in the simpler Use of speaking by *Action*, the Action itself hath no *moral Import*: and so, having but *one* Meaning, the Information it conveys is clear and intelligible. But where a *Rite* of Religion is used for this *speaking Action*, there the *Action* hath a *moral Import*; and so, having two Meanings, its Information is more obscure and mysterious. Hence it appears that this Mode of *speaking Action*, called a *Type*, is exactly fitted for the Information in Question. Just so it is again with the *secondary Sense*. In the *mere Allegory*, the representing Image has no *moral Import*: In the *secondary Sense* (for a contrary Reason, which the very Term imports) it *has*. And so hath the same *fitting Obscurity* with Information by *Types*. For the *typical Ritual*, and the *double Prophecy*, had each its obvious Sense in the *present Nature* and *future Fortune* of the *Jewish Religion* and Republic.

Such, we shall prove, was the wonderful Oeconomy of divine Wisdom, in connecting together two dependent Religions, the Parts of one grand

Dispensation; by this Means, making one preparatory of the other; and each mutually to reflect Light upon the other. Hence we see the desperate Humour of that learned Man, but very sincere *Christian*², who, because most of the Prophecies relating to Jesus, in the *Old Testament*, are of the Nature described above, took it into his Head that the Bible was corrupted by the Enemies of Jesus. Whereas, on the very Supposition of a *mediate* and an *ultimate* Religion, which this good Man holds, the main Body of Prophecies in the *Old Testament* relating to the *New*, must, according to all our Ideas of Fitness and Expediency, needs be *Prophecies of a secondary Sense*. But it is the usual Refuge of Folly to throw its Distresses upon Knavery. And thus, as we observed, the *Mahometans*, likewise, who pretend to claim under the *Jewish Law*, not finding *there* the Doctrine of a *future State of Rewards and Punishments*, are positive that the *Jews* have corrupted their own Scriptures in pure Spite to their great Prophet.

III. Having thus shewn the *reasonable Use* and *great Expediency* of these Modes of sacred Information, under the *Jewish Oeconomy*; the next Question is, Whether they be indeed there. This we shall endeavour to shew. And that none of the common Prejudices may lie against our Reasoning, the Example we give shall be of *Types and Double Prophecies* employed even in Subjects relating to the *Jewish Dispensation only*.

I. The whole Ordinance of the *Passover* was a *Type* of the *Redemption from Egypt*. The striking the Blood on the Side-posts, the eating Flesh with unleavened Bread and bitter Herbs, and in a Posture of Departure and Expedition, were all signifi-

² Mr. Whiston.

cative of their Bondage and Deliverance. This will admit of no Doubt, because the Institutor himself has so declared them — *And thou shalt shew thy Son, (says he) in that Day, saying, This is done because of that which the Lord did unto me, when I came forth out of Egypt. And it shall be a Sign unto thee upon thine Hand, and for a Memorial between thine Eyes; that the Lord's Law may be in thy Mouth. For with a strong Hand hath the Lord brought thee out of Egypt. Thou shalt therefore keep this Ordinance in his Season from Year to Year^a.* As therefore it was the Genius of these holy Rites to be typical or significative of God's past, present, or future Dispensations to his People, we cannot in the least doubt, but that *Moses*, had he not been restrained by those important Considerations explained above, would have told them that the *Sacrifice* of the *Lamb without Blemish* was a *Sign* or *Memorial* of the Death of CHRIST.

2. With regard to DOUBLE PROPHECIES, take this Instance from *Joel*: who, in his Prediction of an approaching Desolation by *Locusts*, foretels, likewise, in the same Words, a succeeding one by the *Assyrian Army*. For we are to observe that this was God's Method in punishing a sinful People. Thus, when the *seven Nations*, for their exceeding Wickedness, were to be utterly exterminated, God promises his chosen People to *send Hornets before them, which should drive out the Hivite, the Canaanite, and the Hittite from before them^b.* Now

^a Exod. xiii. 8, & seq.

^b Exod. xxiii. 28. This, the Author of the Book called the *Wisdom of Solomon* admirably paraphrases: — “ For it was thy
“ Will to destroy by the Hands of our Fathers both those old
“ Inhabitants of thy holy Land, whom thou hatedst for doing
“ most odious Works of Witchcrafts, and wicked Sacrifices; and
“ also those merciless Murderers of Children, and Devourers of

Joel, as we say, under one and the same Prediction, contained in the *first* and *second Chapters* of his *Book* of Prophecies, foretels both these Plagues; the *Locusts* in the *primary* Sense, and the *Assyrian Army* in the *secondary*—“Awake, ye Drunkards, and
 “weep, and howl, all ye Drinkers of Wine, be-
 “cause of the new Wine, for it is cut off from
 “your Mouth. For a Nation is come up upon
 “my Land, strong and without Number; whose
 “Teeth are the Teeth of a Lion, and he hath
 “the Cheek-teeth of a great Lion. He hath laid
 “my Vine waste, and barked my Fig-tree; he hath
 “made it clean bare, and cast it away, the Branches
 “thereof are made white.—The Field is wasted,
 “the Land mourneth; for the Corn is wasted: The
 “new Wine is dried up, the Oil languisheth. Be
 “ye ashamed, O ye Husband-men: Howl, O ye
 “Vine-dressers, for the Wheat and for the Barley;
 “because the Harvest of the Field is perished.—
 “Blow ye the Trumpet in *Zion*, and sound an
 “Alarm in my holy Mountain. Let all the Inha-
 “bitants of the Land tremble: for the Day of the
 “Lord cometh, for it is nigh at hand. A Day

“Man’s Flesh, and the Feasts of Blood; with their Priests out
 “of the Midst of their idolatrous Crew, and the Parents that
 “killed, with their own Hands, Souls destitute of Help: That
 “the Land which thou esteemedst above all other might receive
 “a worthy Colony of God’s Children. Nevertheless even those
 “thou sparedst as Men, *and didst send Wasps, Forerunners of*
 “*thine Host*, to destroy them by little and little. Not that thou
 “wast unable to bring the Ungodly under the Hand of the
 “Righteous in Battle, or to destroy them at once with *cruel*
 “*Beasts*, or with one rough Word: But executing thy Judg-
 “ments upon them by little and little, thou gavest them Place
 “of Repentance, not being ignorant that they were a naughty
 “Generation, and that their Malice was bred in them, and that
 “their Cogitation would never be changed.” Chap xii. v 3.
 & seq.

Chap. i. v 5, & seq.

of

“ of Darkneſs and of Gloomineſs, a Day of Clouds
 “ and of thick Darkneſs, as the Morning ſpread
 “ upon the Mountains : a great People and a ſtrong,
 “ there hath not been ever the like — A Fire de-
 “ voureth before them, and behind them a Flame
 “ burneth : The Land is as the Garden of *Eden*
 “ before them, and behind them a deſolate Wil-
 “ derneſs, yea, and nothing ſhall eſcape them. The
 “ Appearance of them is as the Appearance of
 “ Horſes, and as Horſe-men ſo ſhall they run.
 “ Like the Noiſe of Chariots on the Tops of Moun-
 “ tains ſhall they leap, like the Noiſe of a Flame
 “ of Fire that devoureth the Stubble, as a ſtrong
 “ People ſet in Battle array. Before their Face the
 “ People ſhall be much pained : all Faces ſhall
 “ gather Blackneſs. They ſhall run like mighty
 “ Men, they ſhall climb the Wall like Men of
 “ War, and they ſhall march every one on his
 “ Ways, and they ſhall not break their Ranks ; nei-
 “ ther ſhall one thruſt another, they ſhall walk
 “ every one in his Path : and when they fall upon
 “ the Sword, they ſhall not be wounded. They
 “ ſhall run to and fro in the City : they ſhall run
 “ upon the Wall, they ſhall climb up upon the
 “ Houſes : they ſhall enter in at the Windows like
 “ a Thief. The Earth ſhall quake before them,
 “ the Heavens ſhall tremble, the Sun and the Moon
 “ ſhall be dark, and the Stars ſhall withdraw their
 “ ſhining ^e.”

The fine Contexture of this Prophecy is re-
 markable. It is delivered in the *fiſt Chapter*, —
Awake, ye Drunkards, &c. and repeated in the *ſecond*,
 — *Blow ye the Trumpet in Zion, &c.* — In the *fiſt*
Chapter, the Locuſts are deſcribed as a *People* ;
 — *For a Nation is come up upon my Land, ſtrong and*

without Number. But, that we may understand what is the PRIMARY Sense, the Ravages described are the Ravages of *Insects*: They *lay waste the Vine, bark the Fig-tree, make the Branches clean bare, and wither the Corn and Fruit-trees.* In the second Chapter, the hostile PEOPLE are described as *Locusts.* — *As the Morning spread upon the Mountains. The Appearance of them is AS the Appearance of Horses, and AS Horsemen, so shall they run, AS a strong People set in Battle array. They shall run LIKE mighty Men, they shall climb the Wall LIKE Men of War.* But that we may know what was the SECONDARY Sense, they are compared, we see, to a mighty Army. This Art in the Disposition of the Prophecy is admirable; and renders all Chicane to evade a *double Sense* ineffectual. For in some Places of this Prophecy, *Dearth by Insects* must needs be understood; in others, *Desolation by War.* So that *both* Senses are of Necessity to be taken in. And here let me observe, that had the Commentators on this Prophet but attended to the *Nature* of the *double Sense*, they would not have suffered themselves to be so embarrassed; or have spent so much Time in freeing the Prophet from an imaginary Embarras, though at the Expence of the Context, on Account of the same Prophecy's having in *one Part* that Signification *primary*, which in *another* is *secondary.* A Circumstance so far from inaccurate, that it gives the highest Elegance to the whole, and joins the *two* Senses so closely as to obviate all Pretence for a Division to the Injury of the Holy Spirit. Here then we have a DOUBLE SENSE, not arising from the Interpretation of a single Verse, and so obnoxious to mistake, but of a whole and very large descriptive Prophecy.

But by strange ill Luck, even some *Believers*, as we say, are come at length to deny the very Existence

stence of *double Senses* and *secondary Prophecies*. A late Writer has employed some Pages to proclaim his utter Disbelief of all such Fancies. I shall examine this bold Rectifier of Prejudices : Not for any Thing he has opposed to the Principles here laid down ; for I dare say these were no more in his Thoughts when he wrote, than what he has wrote were in mine when I laid them down ; but only to shew that all he has written is far wide of the Purpose, though, to confess the Truth, no wider than the Notions of those he argues against : Men, who contend for Types and secondary Senses in as extravagant a Way as he opposes them ; that is, such as take a Handle from the Doctrine of double Senses to give a Loose to the Extravagances of a fanatical Imagination. Consequently his Arguments which are aimed against their very *Use* and *Being*, hold only against their *Abuse*. And that *Abuse*, which others indeed have urged as an Argument against the *Use*, he sets himself^e to confute (a mighty Undertaking !) and then mistakes his Reasoning for a Confutation of the *Use*. His Materials and his Project being thus ill sorted, it is no Wonder his Arguments should look askint. One can hardly indeed tell what they look at ; so that if we should chance to attack them on their blind Side, it is not with Design to take them at Advantage, but merely from being deceived by their odd Looks.

His Reasoning against *double Senses* of Prophecies, as far as I understand it, may be divided into two Parts, 1. Replies to the Arguments of others for *double Senses*. 2. His own Arguments against them. With his *Replies* I have nothing to do, (except where something of Argument against the Reality

^e *The Principles and Connection of Natural and Revealed Religion, distinctly considered, p. 221,*

of double Senses is contained) because they are Replies to no Arguments of mine, nor to any I make use of. I have only therefore to consider what he has to say against the Thing itself.

1. His first Argument against more Senses than one is as follows—“Supposing that the Opinion
“or Judgment of the Prophet or Apostle is not to
“be considered in Matters of *Prophecy* more than
“the Judgment of a mere *Amanuensis* is, — and
“that the Point is not what the Opinion of the
“*Amanuensis* was, but what the *Inditer* intended to
“express; yet it must be granted, that if God had
“any Views to some remoter Events, at the same
“Time that the Words which were used were equally
“applicable to, and designed to express *nearer*
“Events; those *remoter* Events, as well as the
“*nearer*, were in the Intention of God: And if
“both the nearer and remoter Events were equally
“intended by God in any Proposition, then the
“LITERAL SENSE OF THEM IS NOT THE ONE
“NOR THE OTHER SINGLY AND APART, BUT
“BOTH TOGETHER must be the full Meaning
“of such Passages^f.

—Then the literal Sense of them is not the one nor the other singly and apart, but both of them together, &c. i. e. if both together make up but one literal Sense, then there is neither a *secondary* nor a *double* Sense: And so there's an End of the Controversy. A formidable Adversary truly! He threatens to *overthrow the Thing*, and gives us an Argument against the *Propriety of the Term*. Let him but allow his Adversaries that a *nearer* and a *remoter* Event are both the Subjects of one and the same Prediction, and, I suppose, it will be indifferent to them whether he calls it, with them, a *Prophecy of a double and*

^f p. 219.

secondary Sense, or they call it, with him, a *Prophecy of a single literal Sense*; and he ought to be thankful for so much Complaisance, for 'tis plain they have the better of him even in the *Propriety of the Term*. It is allowed that God, in these Predictions, might have Views to *nearer* and *remoter* Events; now these nearer and remoter Events were Events under two *different* Dispensations, the *Jewish* and the *Christian*. The Prediction is addressed to the *Jews*, who had not only a more immediate Concern with the *first*, but, at the Time of giving the Prophecy, were not to be let into the Secrets of the *other*: Hence the Prediction of the *nearer* Event was properly the *literal* or *primary* Sense, as given for the *present* Information of God's Servants; and the more *remote* Event for their *future* Information, and so was as properly the *secondary* Sense, called with great Propriety *figurative*, because conveyed under the Terms which predicted the *nearer* Event. But I hope a *first* and a *second*, a *literal* and a *figurative*, may make up a *double Sense*.

2. His second Argument runs thus, — “ WORDS
“ are the Signs of our Thoughts, and therefore
“ stand for the Ideas in the Mind of him that uses
“ them. If then Words are made use of to signify
“ *two or more Things at the same Time*, their Si-
“ gnificancy is really lost, and it is impossible to
“ understand the real certain Intention of him that
“ uses them. Were God therefore to discover any
“ Thing to Mankind by any written Revelation,
“ and were he to make use of such TERMS as stand
“ for Ideas in Mens Minds, he must speak to them
“ so as to be understood by them. They must have
“ in their Minds the Ideas which God intended to
“ excite in them, or else it would be in vain to at-
“ tempt to make Discoveries of his Will; and the
“ TERMS made use of must be such as were wont
to

“ to raise such certain Ideas, or else there could be
 “ no written Revelation. The true Sense therefore
 “ of *any Passage* of Scripture can be but ONE; or
 “ if it be said to contain more Senses than one, if
 “ such Multiplicity be not revealed, the Revelation
 “ becomes useless, because unintelligible.”

Men may talk what they please of *Unintelligibility* in Writers who have *two Senses*, but it has been my Fortune to meet with it much oftener in those who have *not one*! Our Reasoner has here mistaken the very Question, which is, whether a Scripture PROPOSITION (for all *Prophecies* are reducible to *Propositions*) be capable of *two Senses*; and, to support the Negative, he labours to prove that WORDS or TERMS can have *but one*. — If then WORDS are made use of to signify two or more THINGS at the same Time, their Significancy is really lost — such TERMS as stand for Ideas in Mens Minds — TERMS made use of must be such as are wont to raise such certain Ideas. — Now all this is readily allowed, but how utterly wide of the Purpose, may be seen by this Instance: *Jacob* says, *I will go down into Sheol unto my Son mourning*. Now if SHEOL signify in the ancient Hebrew only the Grave, it would be an abusive Interpretation to make it signify likewise, with the vulgar Latin, *in infernum*, because here the Interpreters were giving not the Sense of a Proposition, but the Sense of a Word; and if WORDS (as he says) be made to signify two or more Things at the same Time, their Significancy is lost. — But where the Psalmist says, *Thou wilt not leave my Soul in Hell [SHEOL] neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see Corruption*; it is very different as well as reasonable, to interpret this, where the Sense of the whole Proposition, not of a single Word, is the Sub-

ject of Enquiry, in a *spiritual* Sense of the Resurrection of the Body of CHRIST from the Grave, and the Reduction of his Soul from the Region or Receptacle of departed Spirits; tho' at the same Time there be a *literal Sense* allowed; in which the *Words* translated *Soul* and *Hell*, are left in the Meaning they bear, in the *Hebrew* Tongue, of *Body* and *Grave*.

But let us suppose our Reasoner to mean that a *Proposition* is not capable of *two Senses*, as perhaps he did; for notwithstanding his express Words to the contrary, yet, before he comes to the End of his Argument, he talks of *the true Sense* of ANY *PASSAGE* being but one; and then his Assertion must be, *That if one Proposition have two Senses, its Significancy is really lost; and that 'tis impossible to understand the real certain Intention of him that uses them; consequently Revelation will become useless, because unintelligible.*

Now this I will take the Liberty to deny. — In the following Instances a *single Proposition* was intended by the Writers and Speakers to have a *double Sense*, as he himself shall own. The Poet *Virgil* says,

——“ Talia, per clypeum Volcani, dona parentis
“ Miratur: rerumque ignarus, imagine gaudet,
“ ATTOLLENS HUMERO FAMAMQUE ET FATA
“ NEPOTUM ^h.”

The last Line has these *two Senses*: *First*, that *Æneas* bore upon his Shoulders a Shield, on which was engraved an historical Picture of the Fame and Fortunes of his Posterity: *Secondly*, that under the Protection of that Piece of Armour he established their Fame and Fortunes, and was enabled to make

^h *Æneid.* lib. viii. in fin.

a Settlement in *Latium*, which proved the Foundation of the *Roman Empire*.

Here then is a *double Sense*, which, I believe, none who have any Taste of *Virgil* will deny. The preceding Verse introduces it with great Art,

“*Miratur, rerumque ignarus imagine gaudet:*”

as preparing us for something a little mysterious, and hid behind the Letter.

The Holy Spirit, in sacred Scripture, says to *Peter*, on his refusing to touch promiscuously, in the famous Vision of clean and unclean Meats, *What God hath cleansed that call not thou common*ⁱ. The Proposition is, *That which God hath cleansed is not common*; but no one who reads this Story can doubt of its having this *double Sense*: 1. *That the Distinction between clean and unclean Meats was to be abolished.* 2. *And That the Gentiles were to be called into the Church of CHRIST.* — Here then the true Sense of these PASSAGES is not *one*, but *two*; and yet the Intention or Meaning is not on this Account the least obscured or lost, or rendered doubtful or unintelligible.

He will say, perhaps, that the very Nature of the Subject, in both Cases, determines the two Senses here explained. — And does he think we will not say the same of *double Senses* in the Prophecies? It is true he seems to take it for granted, that *Judaism* and *Christianity* have no manner of relation to one another: Why else would he bring, in Discredit of a *double Sense*, these two Verses of *Virgil*,

“*Hi motus animorum, atque hæc certamina tanta*

“*Pulveris exigui jactu composita quiescunt.*”

On which he thus descants, — *The Words are determinate and clear.* — Suppose now a Man having Oc-

ⁱ ACTS x. 15.

casion to speak of intermitting Fevers and the Ruffle of a Man's Spirits, and the easy Cure of the Disorder by pulverized Bark^k, &c. To make this pertinent, we must suppose no more relation between the Fortunes of the Jewish Church and the Christian, than between a Battle of Bees, and the Tumult of the Animal Spirits: if this were not his Meaning it will be hard to know what was, unless to shew his happy Talent at a Parody.

But as he seems to delight in classical Authorities, I will give him one not quite so absurd; where a double Meaning does in fact run thro' one of the finest Odes of Antiquity. Horace thus addresses a crazy Ship in which his Friends had embarked for the *Ægean Sea*:

“ O navis, referent in mare te novi
 “ Fluctus! ô quid agis? fortiter occupa
 “ Portum: nonne vides ut
 “ Nudum remigio latus^l, &c.

In the first and primary Sense he describes the Dangers of his Friends in a weak unarmed Vessel, and in a tempestuous Sea; in the *secondary*, the Dangers of the Republic in entering into a fresh civil War, after all the Losses and Disasters of the preceding. As to the *secondary Sense*, which is ever the most questionable and obscure, we have the Testimony of early Antiquity delivered by Quintilian; as to the *primary Sense*, the following Lines confine us to it:

“ Nuper sollicitum quæ mihi tædium,
 “ Nunc desiderium, curaque non levis,
 “ Interfusa nitentes
 “ Vites æquora Cycladas.

^k p. 225.

^l Hor. Od. lib. i. Od. 14.

But the Critics not apprehending the *distinct* Natures of the *two* kinds of *Allegories* explained above; the *first* of which, *viz.* the *proper* Allegory, has but *one real Sense*, because the literal Meaning, which serves only for the *Envelope*, being of no *moral Import*, is not to be reckoned; the *second* has *two*, because the literal Meaning is of *moral Import*; and of this Nature are *double* Prophecies: The Critics, I say, not apprehending these two Kinds, have engaged in very warm Contests. The one Side seeing some Parts of the Ode to relate necessarily to a real Ship, will have the Ode to be *purely historical*; at the Head of whom is *Tanaquil Faber*, who first started this Criticism, after fifteen Centuries peaceable Possession of the allegorical Sense: The other Side, on the Authority of *Quintilian*, who gives the Ode as an Example of an *Allegory*, will have it to be *purely allegorical*. Whereas it is evidently both one and the other; of the Nature of the *second* Kind of Allegories, which have a *double Sense*; and this *double Sense*, which does not in the least obscure the Meaning, the learned Reader sees adds infinite Beauty to the Composition. Had it been *purely historical*, nothing had been more cold or trifling; had it been *purely allegorical*, nothing less gracious or more affected: But suppose it *both*, and that under his immediate Concern for his Friends, he conveyed his more distant Apprehensions for the Republic, and there is so much Ease, and Art, and Dignity in every Period, as makes it the most finished Composition of Antiquity.

What is it then that makes a *double Sense* so ridiculous and absurd in, *Hi motus animorum, &c.* and so noble and rational in, *O Navis, referent, &c.*? Why this, and this only, that, in the *latter* Case, the Subject of the *two Senses* had a close Connexion in the Interests of the Writer; in the *former*, none at all.

all. Now that which makes two Senses *reasonable*, at the same Time, ever makes them *intelligible and obvious*. But if so, then a *double Sense* in *Prophecies* must be both *reasonable* and *intelligible*: For I think no *Believer* will deny that there was the closest Connexion between the *Jewish* and *Christian* Systems, in the Dispensations of the Holy Spirit.

3. His next Argument runs thus — “ If God is
 “ disposed to reveal to Mankind any Truths — he
 “ must convey them in such a Manner that they
 “ may be understood — if he speaks to Men, he must
 “ condescend to their Infirmities and Capacities —
 “ Now if he were to contrive a Proposition in such
 “ a Manner — that the same Proposition should re-
 “ late to *several* Events; the Consequence would
 “ be, that as often as Events happened which
 “ agreed to any Proposition, so often would the Re-
 “ velation be accomplished. But this would only
 “ serve to increase the Confusion of Mens Minds,
 “ and never to clear up any Prophecy: No Man
 “ could say what was intended by the Spirit of
 “ God: And if MANY Events were intended, it
 “ would be the same Thing as if no Event was
 “ intended at all ^m. ”

I all along suspected he was talking against what he did not understand. He proposed to shew the Absurdity of a *double* or *secondary Sense* ⁿ of Prophecies; and now he tells us of MANY Senses; and endeavours to shew how *this* would make Prophecy useless. But sure he should have known, what the very Phrase itself intimates, that no prophetic Proposition is pretended to have more than TWO Senses: And farther, that the Subject of each is supposed to relate to *two different* and successive Dispensations: which is so far from creating any

^m p. 226.

ⁿ See p. 221.

Confusion in Men's Minds, or making a *Prophecy useless*, that it must needs strengthen and confirm our Belief, and give *double Evidence* of the Divinity of the Prediction. But it is plain he would insinuate, that what orthodox Divines mean by a *second Sense*, is the same with what the *Scotch Prophets* mean by a *second Sight*; where Men see one Thing after another as long as their Imaginations hold out.

4. His last Argument is — “ Nor is it any
 “ Ground for such a Supposition, that the Prophets
 “ being FULL OF THE IDEAS of the *Messiah*, and
 “ his glorious Kingdom, MADE USE OF IMAGES
 “ taken from thence, to express the Points upon
 “ which they had Occasion to speak. For *whence-*
 “ *soever* they took their Ideas, yet when they spoke
 “ of *present Facts*, it was *present Facts* only that
 “ were to be understood. Common Language, and
 “ the Figures of it, and the Manner of Expression;
 “ the *Metaphors*, the *Hyperboles*, and all the usual
 “ Forms of Speech are to be considered: And if
 “ the Occasions of the Expression are taken from a
 “ *future State*, yet still the Proposition is to be in-
 “ terpreted of that *one Thing* to which it is parti-
 “ cularly applied.”

Orthodox Divines have supported the Reasonableness and Probability of *double Senses* by this material Observation, that the inspired Writers were *full of the Ideas* of the *Christian Dispensation*. That is, there being so close a Relation between this and the *Jewish*, of which it was the Completion, whenever they spoke of any of the remarkable Fortunes of the *one*, they interwove with it those of the *other*. Which no Man can deny, who believes, 1. That there is that Relation between the two Religions. And 2. That these inspired Men were let into the

Nature and future Fortunes of both. See now how our Author represents this Matter. It is no Ground, he says, for a *double Sense*, that the Prophets were full of the Ideas of a Messiah and his glorious Kingdom, and made use of Images taken from thence; that is, that they enobled their Style by the habitual Contemplation of magnificent Ideas. For (continues he) *whencesoever they took their Ideas, when they spoke of present Facts, present Facts alone were to be understood. Common Language and the Figures of it, &c.*—Without Doubt, from such a *Fulness of Ideas*, as only raised and enobled their Style, it could be no more concluded that they meant *future Facts*, when they speak of *present*, than that because *Virgil* was full of the magnificent Ideas of the Roman Grandeur, therefore, where he says, *Priami Imperium—Divum Domus, Ilium, & Ingens gloria Teucrorum*, he meant *Rome* as well as *Troy*. But what is all this to the Purpose? Orthodox Divines talk of a *Fulness of Ideas* arising from the Holy Spirit's revealing the *mutual Dependency* and *future Fortunes* of the two Dispensations, and revealing them for the Information, Solace, and Support of God's Church. And he talks of a *Fulness of Ideas* got no body knows how, and used no body knows why, to raise their Style and enoble their Images. Let him give some Account of this Representation, and then we may be able to determine, if it be worth determining, whether he here put the Change upon himself or his Readers.

From hence, to the End of the Chapter, he goes on to examine particular Texts urged against his Opinion; with which I have at present nothing to do: first, because the proper Subject of this Section is the Nature of *Types* and *double Senses* in the general: and secondly, because what Room I have to spare, on this Head, is for a much welcomer

Guest, who I am now returning to, the original Author of these Notions, the Great Mr. Collins himself.

However it may not be amiss to hear his Conclusion: "There is THEN but one literal real Sense of any Prophecy; and that contains the whole that God designed to reveal." Then! When? Why when all the Rules of Logic and Criticism are reduced to our Author's Standard, and the Bible publicly received with his Interpretation. For he tells us, that *though it be generally read and studied by the Learned of all Nations, and so many Commentaries have been wrote upon it, yet a RIGHT GOOD critical grammatical Comment has never yet been finished*. This, he says, *may seem strange*. I should think so too; but yet much stranger, if the Public should expect such a Comment from our Author.

II.

To proceed. We have shewn that *Types and secondary Senses* are rational, logical, and *scholastic* Modes of Information: that they were expedient and highly useful under the *Jewish Oeconomy*; and that they were indeed there.

But now it will be objected, that, as far as relates to the *Jewish Oeconomy*, a *double Sense* may be allowed; because the Affairs of that Dispensation may be well supposed to be in the Thoughts of the Prophet; but it is unreasonable to make one of the Senses relate to a different and remote Dispensation never in his Thoughts. *For the Books of the Old Testament* (Mr. Collins assures us) *seem the most plain of all ancient Writings, and wherein there appears not the least Trace of a Typical or Allegorical*

Intention in the Authors or in any other Jews of their Time^r.

I reply, that was it even as our Adversaries suggest, that *all* the Prophecies, which, we say, relate to JESUS, relate to him only in a *secondary* Sense; and that there were no other Intimations of the new Dispensation but what such Prophecies convey; it would not follow that *such* Sense was false or groundless. And this I have clearly shewn in the Account of their Nature, Original, and Use. Thus much I confess, that without *Miracles*, in Confirmation of *such* Sense, *some* of them would difficultly be proved to have it; because, as we have shewn, a commodious and designed Obscurity attends both their Nature and their Use. But then this let me add, and these Pretenders to Reason would do well to consider it, that the Authority of superior Wisdom as rationally determines the Assent to the Meaning of a *doubtful* Proposition, as any other kind of Logical Evidence whatsoever.

But this is by no Means the Case. We say farther, 1. That some of the Prophecies relate to JESUS in a *primary* Sense. 2. That besides these, there are in the Prophetic Writings, the most clear and certain Intimations of the *Gospel Oeconomy*.

I. That some Prophecies relate to the *Messiah* in a *primary* Sense, has been invincibly proved by a very learned Prelate^s. I shall mention therefore but one, and that only because our Adversary has made some Remarks upon it, which will afford an Occasion for farther Illustration of the Subject. — JESUS says of *John the Baptist* — *This is the Elias that was for to come.* “Wherein (says the Author “of the *Grounds*, &c.) he is supposed to refer to “these Words of *Malachi*, *Behold, I will send you*

^s *Grounds*, p. 82.

^s The present Bishop of *Durham*.

“ *Elijah the Prophet before the coming of the great and*
 “ *terrible Day of the Lord*; which, according to their
 “ LITERAL Sense, are a Prophecy, that *Elijah* or
 “ *Elias* was to come in Person, and therefore not
 “ LITERALLY but MYSTICALLY fulfilled in *John*
 “ *the Baptist*.” And again, in his Scheme of li-
 teral Prophecy considered, speaking of this Passage of
Malachi, he says, “ But to cut off all Pretence for a
 “ literal Prophecy, I observe, first, That the literal
 “ Interpretation of this Place is, that *Elias*, the
 “ real *Elias* was to come. And is it not a MOST
 “ PLEASANT literal Interpretation to make *Elias*
 “ not signify *Elias*, but some body who resembled
 “ him in Qualities? — Secondly, I observe, that
 “ the *Septuagint* Translators render it, *Elias the*
 “ *Tishbite*, — and that the *Jews*, since CHRIST’S
 “ Time, have generally understood, from the Pas-
 “ sage before us, that *Elias is to come in Person*.
 “ — But *John Baptist* himself, who must be sup-
 “ posed to know who he was himself, when the
 “ Question was asked him, *whether he was Elias*,
 “ denied himself to be *Elias*; and when asked
 “ who he was, said, he was the Voice of one
 “ crying in the Wilderness, &c. which is a Pas-
 “ sage taken from *Isaiah*.”

I. The first Thing observable in these curious
 Remarks is, that this great Philosopher and Divine
 did not so much as understand the Terms of the
 Question. The Words, says he, *according to their*
literal Sense, are a Prophecy, that Elijah was to come
in Person, and therefore not literally but mystically
fulfilled in John the Baptist. He did not so much
 as know the Meaning of a *primary* and *secondary*
Sense, about which he makes all this Bustle. A
secondary Sense indeed implies a *figurative* Interpre-

^t *Grounds*, p. 47, 48.

^v p. 127.

tation ; a *primary* a *literal* : But yet this *primary* Sense does not exclude *figurative* TERMS. The *primary* or *literal* Sense of the Prophecy in Question is, that, before the great and terrible Day of the Lord, a Messenger should be sent, resembling in Character the Prophet *Elijah* ; this Messenger, by a *Figure*, is called the Prophet *Elijah*. A Figure of the most easy and natural Import ; and of especial Use amongst the *Hebrews*, who were accustomed to denote any *Character* or *Action* by *that* of the kind which was become most known or celebrated. Thus the Prophet *Isaiah* : “ And the Lord shall utterly de-
 “ stroy the *Tongue* of the *Egyptian* Sea, and with
 “ his mighty Wind shall he shake his Hand
 “ over the River, and shall smite it in the *seven*
 “ *Streams* ^{w.}” — Here a second Passage through the *Red Sea* is promised in *literal Terms* : But who therefore will say that this is the *literal Meaning* ? The *literal Meaning*, though the Prophecy be in *figurative Terms*, is simply Redemption from Bondage. For *Egypt*, in the *Hebrew Phrase*, signified a Place of Bondage. Would not he be thought an admirable Interpreter of *Virgil* who should criticise the *Roman Poet* in the same Manner ? — *Virgil seems the most plain of all ancient Writings* : And he says,

“ Jam redit & Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna.”

Which, according to its literal Meaning, is, that the Virgin returns, and old Saturn reigns again, in Person ; and therefore not LITERALLY, but MYSTICALLY fulfilled in the Justice and Felicity of Augustus's Reign. And it is a MOST PLEASANT literal Interpretation, to make the Virgin and Saturn not signify the Virgin and Saturn, but some-

^w Chap. xi. v 15.

body who resembled them in Qualities. Such Prate, in a classical Critic, would be called *Nonsense* in every Language. But Freethinking sanctifies all sorts of Impertinence. — This was a kind of compound Blunder: LITERAL, in common Speech, being opposed both to *figurative* and to *spiritual*; and MYSTICAL signifying both *figurative* and *spiritual*; he confounded the distinct and different Meanings both of LITERAL and MYSTICAL.

He goes on — *I observe, that the Septuagint Translators render it Elias the Tishbite — and that the Jews since CHRIST's Time have generally understood from this Passage, that Elias is to come in Person. And John Baptist himself, who must be supposed to know who he was himself, when the Question was asked him, denied himself to be Elias — Since CHRIST's Time! Why not before, when it appears so from his own Account of the Translation of the Septuagint? For this plain Reason; we should then have seen why John the Baptist, when asked, denied himself to be Elias; which it was not the Author's Design we should see. The Case stood thus: At the Time of the Septuagint Translation, and from thence to the Time of CHRIST, the Doctrine of a Transmigration, and of a Resurrection of the Body, to repossess the Land of Judea, were national Opinions, which occasioned the Jews, by Degrees, to understand all these sorts of figurative Expressions literally. Hence, amongst their many Visions, the understanding, from this Prophecy, that Elias was to come again in Person, was one. This shews what it was the Jews asked John the Baptist; and what it was he answered, when he denied himself to be Elias: Not that he was not the Messenger prophesied of by Malachi (for his pretending to be that Messenger was evidently the Occasion of the Question) but that*

that he was not, nor did the Prophecy imply that the Messenger should be *Elias in Person*.

But farther, let us consider a similar Prophecy of *Amos*: *Behold the Days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a FAMINE in the Land, not a Famine of Bread, nor a Thirst of Water, but of hearing the Words of the Lord**. I would ask, is this a Prophecy of a Famine of the Word in a literal, or in a mystical Sense? Without doubt the Deist will own (if ever he expects we should appeal again to his Ingenuity) in a literal. But now strike out the Explanation [*not a Famine of Bread, nor a Thirst of Water*] and what is it then? Is it not still a Famine of the Word in a literal Sense? Mystical, if you will, in the Meaning of *metaphorically obscure*, but not in the Meaning of *spiritual*. But mystical in this latter Signification only is opposed to *literal*, in the Question about *secondary Senses*. It appears then, that a Want of preaching the Word was still the literal Meaning of the Prophecy, whether the Explanation was in or out, though the figurative Term [*Famine*] was used to express it. And the Reason why the Prophet explains the Term, was not, because it was a harsh or unnatural Figure, to denote *Want of Preaching*, any more than the Term *Elijah* to denote a similar Character, which *Malachi* does not explain; but because the Prophecy of *Amos* might have been mistaken, and the figurative Term understood literally; the People being, at that Time, often punished for their Sins by a Famine of Bread.

But this abusive Cavil at figurative Terms puts me in mind of his Observations on the following Prophecy of *Isaiah* — “Even them will I bring to my holy Mountain, and make them joyful in

* Chap. viii. v. 11.

“ my House of Prayer: their Burnt-offerings and
 “ their Sacrifices shall be accepted upon mine Al-
 “ tar; for mine House shall be called an House of
 “ Prayer FOR ALL PEOPLE.” This, he says, must
 needs relate to *Jewish*, not to *Christian* Times.
 Why? because *Sacrifices* are mentioned. But how
 could this Truth be told the *Jewish* People, *that*
all Nations should be gathered to the true God, other-
 wise than by using Terms taken from *Rites* familiar
 to them, unless the Nature of the *Christian* Dispen-
 sation had been previously explained? A Matter
 evidently unfit for their Information, when they were
 yet to live so long under the *Jewish*.

Thus then stands the Argument of this mighty
 Reasoner. There are *no* Prophecies, he says, that
 relate to JESUS but in a *secondary Sense*. Now a se-
 condary Sense is *unscholastic* and *enthusiastical*. To
 this we answer, that the Prophecy of *Malachi* about
Elijah, and of *Isaiab* about bringing all People to
 his holy Mountain, relate to JESUS in a *primary*
Sense. He replies, No, but in a *mystical only*. Here
 he begins to quibble, the sure Sign of an expiring
 Argument: *Mystical* signifies as well *secondary* as
figurative. In the Sense of *secondary*, the Interpre-
 tation of these Prophecies to JESUS is *not mystical*,
 in the Sense of *figurative* it is. But is the Use of
 a *figurative Term* *enthusiastical* or *unscholastic*?
 Now whether we are to charge this to an ill Faith
 or a worse Understanding, his own Followers shall
 determine for me.

2. But we will grant the utmost an ingenuous
 Adversary can ask — That most of the Prophecies
 in Question relate to JESUS in a *secondary Sense only*;
 the rest in a *primary*, but expressed in *figurative*
 Terms; which, till their Completion, threw a

Shade over their Meaning, and kept them in a certain Degree of Obscurity. To shew how all this came about, will add still farther Light to this very perplexed Question.

We have seen, from the Nature and long Duration of the *Jewish* Oeconomy, that the Prophecies which relate to JESUS, must needs be darkly and covertly delivered: We have seen how the *Allegoric* Mode of Speech, then much in Use, furnished a proper Means, by what we call a *double Sense* in Prophecies of doing this with all the requisite Obscurity. But as some of these, by their proper Light alone, without Miracles in their Confirmation, could hardly have the Sense contended for well ascertained, it pleased the Holy Spirit (to render all Gainfayers of the Gospel without Excuse) to give Credentials to the Mission of JESUS, under the last Race of the Prophets, by Predictions of him in a *primary* and *literal* Sense. But the *Jewish* Religion, being yet of long Continuance, there still remained the same Necessity of an obscure mysterious Conveyance. That figurative Expression therefore, which was before employed in the *Proposition*, was now used in the *Terms*. Hence the Prophecies of a single Sense come to be in highly *figurative Words*: As before, the earlier *Prophecies* of a double Sense, which had a *primary* Meaning in the Affairs of the *Jewish* State, and, for the present Information of that People, were delivered in much simpler Phrase.

The *Jewish* Doctors, whose obstinate Adherence, not to the *Letter* of the *Law*, as this Writer ignorantly suggests, but to the mystic Interpretations of the *Cabala*, prevents their seeing the true Cause of this Difference in the Language between the *earlier* and *later* Prophets, are extremely perplexed to give a tolerable Account of it. What they best agree in
is,

is, that the figurative enigmatic Style of the later Prophets (which however they make infinitely more obscure by cabalistic Meanings, than it really is, in order to evade their relation to JESUS) is owing to the *declining State of Prophecy*. Every Prophet, says the famous Rabbi *Joseph Albo*, that is of a strong, sagacious, and piercing Understanding, will apprehend the Thing nakedly without any Similitude; whence it comes to pass that all his Sayings are distinct and clear, and free from all Obscurity, having a literal Truth in them: But a Prophet of an inferior Rank or Degree, his Words are obscure, enwrapped in Riddles and Parables; and therefore have not a literal but allegorical Truth contained in them². And indeed Rabbi *Collins* seems to have had as little Knowledge of this Matter as Rabbi *Albo*; for in Answer to what Mr. *Whiston* rightly observed, that the Prophecies [meaning the primary] which relate to Christianity, are covered, mystical, and enigmatical (for as extravagant as he was in rejecting all double Senses, he knew the Difference between a secondary and an enigmatic Prophecy, which we shall see our Author did not) in Answer, I say, to Mr. *Whiston*, he replies, *This is exactly equal Mysticism with, and just as remote from the real literal Sense as the Mysticism of the Allegorists [i. e. the Contenders for a double Sense] and is altogether as OBSCURE to the Understanding*^a. His Argument against secondary Senses is, that they are *unscholastic and enthusiastical*. Mr. *Whiston*, to humour him, presents him with direct and primary Prophecies, but tells him, at the same Time, they are expressed in covered, mystical, and enigmatic Terms. This will not satisfy him, it is no better than the Mysticism of the Allegorists.

² Smith's *Select Discourses*, p. 180.
p. 242.

^a *The Grounds, &c.*

How so? The Reader may think, perhaps, our Author would pretend to shew (because his Argument requires it) that *enigmatical Expressions* were as *unscholastic* and *enthusiastical* as *secondary Senses*. No such Matter. All he says is, that they are as *OBSCURE to the Understanding*. But *Obscurity* is not his Quarrel with *secondary Senses*; it is because they are *unscholastic* and *enthusiastical*. But here lay the Difficulty; no Man, who pretended to any Language, could say this of *figurative enigmatical Expressions*; he was forced therefore to have Recourse to his usual Refuge *OBSCURITY*.

It is true, he says, these *mystical enigmatic Prophecies*, as Mr. *Whiston* calls them, are equally remote from the real literal Sense, as the *Mysticism* of the *Allegorists*. But this is only a Repetition of his Blunder exposed above, where he could not distinguish between the *literal Sense* of a *Term*, and the *literal Sense* of a *Proposition*. For Instance, *Isaiab* says, *The Wolf also shall dwell with the Lamb, and the Leopard shall lie down with the Kid; and the Calf, and the young Lion, and the Fatling together, and a little Child shall lead them*^b. Now I will take it for granted his Followers understand this, with *Grotius*, of the profound Peace that was to follow after the Times of *Senacherib*, under *Hezekiab*. But tho' the *Terms* be *mystical*, yet sure they call this the *literal Sense* of the Prophecy: For *Grotius* makes the *mystical Sense* to refer to the Gospel. Mr. *Whiston*, I suppose, denies that this has any thing to do with the Times of *Hezekiab*, but that it refers to those of *CHRIST* only. Is not *his* Interpretation therefore *literal* as well as that of *Grotius*? unless it immediately becomes *odly typical*, *unscholastic*, and *enthusiastical*, as soon as ever *JESUS* comes into the Question.

^b Chap. xi. § 6.

II. But now, besides the *literal primary* Prophecies concerning the PERSON of JESUS, there are others that give as direct Intimation of the CHANGE of the Dispensation. *Isaiab* foretels great Mercies to the *Jews*, in a future Age; which, tho' represented by such Metaphors as bore Analogy to the Blessings peculiar to the *Jewish* Oeconomy, yet, to shew them different from what the *figurative Terms* alluded to, the Prophet at the same Time adds, *My Thoughts are not as your Thoughts, neither are your Ways my Ways, saith the Lord^c*. This implies a different Dispensation. That the *Change* was from *carnal* to *spiritual*, is elegantly intimated in the subjoining Words, — *For as the HEAVENS are higher than the EARTH, so are my Ways higher than your Ways, and my Thoughts than your Thoughts^d*. But this higher and more excellent Dispensation is plainly revealed in the following Figure: *Instead of the Thorn shall come up the Fir-tree, and instead of the Brier shall come up the Myrtle-tree^e; i. e.* the new Religion should as far excel the old, as the Fir-tree the Thorn, or the Myrtle the Brier. In a following Prophecy he shews the *Extent* of this new Religion, as here the *Nature*; that it was to spread its Limits beyond *Judea*, and to take in the whole Race of Mankind, — *The Gentiles shall come to thy Light, and Kings to the Brightness of thy rising^f &c.* Which Idea the Prophet *Zephaniab* expresses in so strong a Manner, as leaves no room for Evasion: *The Lord will be terrible unto them, for he will FARMISH all the Gods of the Earth, and Men shall worship him every one from his Place, even all the Isles of the Gentiles^g*. The Expression is noble, and alludes to the popular Superstitions of Paganism, that their Gods were nourished by the Steam of the Sacrifices.

^c Chap. lv. v. 8.^d v. 9.^e v. 13.^f Chap. lx. v. 3.^g Chap. ii. v. 11.

But

But when were the Pagan Gods thus *famished*, but in the first Ages of *Christianity*? — *Every one from his Place*; that is, they were not to go up to *Jerusalem* to worship. — *Even all the Isles of the Gentiles*. But when did they worship the God of *Israel* before the preaching of the Apostles? Then indeed their speedy and general Conversion distinguished them from the rest of the Nations.

But *Isaiab*, as he goes on, is still more explicate, and declares, in direct Terms, that the Dispensation should be changed: *Behold, I create new Heavens and a new Earth; and the former shall not be remembered, nor come into mind*^h. This, in the Prophetic Style, means a *new RELIGION* and a *new LAW*; the Metaphors, as we have shewn elsewhere, being taken from *hieroglyphical* Expression. To make it still more clear, I observe farther, the Prophet goes on in declaring the *Change* of the SANCTION; a necessary Consequence of the *Change* of the Dispensation, — *There shall be no more thence an Infant of Days, nor an old Man that hath not filled his Days: For the Child shall die an hundred Years old, but the Sinner being an hundred Years old shall be accursed*ⁱ; i. e. the *Jewish* Sanction of temporal Rewards and Punishments shall be no longer administered in an extraordinary Manner: For we must remember, that *long Life* for Obedience, and *sudden and immature Death* for Transgressions, bore an eminent Part in their Rewards and Punishments: Now these are expressly said to be abrogated in the Dispensation promised, it being declared that the *Virtuous*, tho' dying untimely, should be as if they had lived an hundred Years; and *Sinners*, tho' living to an hundred Years, as if they had died untimely.

^h Chap. lxxv. v. 17.ⁱ v. 20.

The very same Prophecy in *Jeremiah*, delivered in less figurative Terms, ascertains this Interpretation beyond all possible Cavil: “Behold the Days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a NEW COVENANT with the House of *Israel*, and with the House of *Judah*, not according to the Covenant that I made with their Fathers, in the Day that I took them by the Hand, to bring them out of the Land of *Egypt*. — But *this shall be the Covenant* that I will make with the House of *Israel*, After those Days, saith the Lord, *I will put my Law in their inward Parts, and write it in their Hearts* ^k.” —

What *Isaiah* figuratively calls a *new Heaven and a new Earth*, *Jeremiah* simply and literally names a *new Covenant*. And what kind of Covenant? not such an one as was made with their Fathers. This was declarative enough of its Nature; yet to prevent Mistakes, he gives as well a *positive* as *negative* Description of it: *This shall be the Covenant, I will put my Law in their inward Parts, &c. i. e.* this Law shall be *spiritual*, as the other, given to their Fathers, was *carnal*: For the *Jewish* Law did not scrutinize the Heart, but rested in external Obedience and Observances.

Lastly, to crown the whole, I observe that *Jeremiah* too, like *Isaiah*, ascertains the Argument by declaring, at the same Time, the CHANGE of the SANCTION: “In those Days they shall say no more, the Fathers have eaten a sour Grape, and the Childrens Teeth are set on edge. But every one shall die for his own Iniquity, every Man that eateth the sour Grape, his Teeth shall be set on edge^l.” For we know it to have been Part of the Sanction of the *Jewish* Law, that Children should bear the Iniquity of their Fathers, &c. a

Mode of punishing, which has been already explained and justified.

Notwithstanding all this, if you will believe our Adversary, *The Books of the Old Testament seem the most PLAIN of all ancient Writings, and wherein there appears NOT THE LEAST TRACE OF A TYPICAL OR ALLEGORICAL INTENTION in the Authors, or in any other Jews of their Times*^m. He that answers a *Free-thinker* has a fine Time of it. *Not the least Trace of a typical or allegorical Intention!* He might as well have said there is no Trace of Poetry in *Virgil*, or of Eloquence in *Cicero*. But there is none, he says, *either in the Authors, or in any other Jews of their Times*. To both which Assertions this single Text of *Ezekiel* will serve for a Confutation, — *Ab Lord, THEY SAY OF ME, DO TH HE NOT SPEAK PARABLES*ⁿ? The Prophet complains that the Fruitlessness of his Mission proceeded from the People's regarding him as speaking of mysterious Things not understood by them. The Author of the Book of *Ecclesiasticus*, who is reasonably supposed to have been contemporary with *Antiochus Epiphanes*, speaks of the holy Scriptures as fully fraught with typical and allegoric Wisdom: “He that giveth his Mind
“to the Law of the Most High, and is occupied
“in the Meditation thereof, will seek out the Wisdom of the Ancients, AND BE OCCUPIED IN
“PROPHECIES. He will keep the Sayings of the
“renowned Men, and where SUBTILE PARABLES
“are, he will be there also. He will seek out the
“SECRETS OF GRAVE SENTENCES, and be conversant in DARK PARABLES^o.” Hence it appears, that Prophecies were not so *plain* as our Author re-

^m *Grounds*, &c. p. 82.

ⁿ Chap. xx. § 49.

^o — ἐν προφητείαις ἀχοληθήσεται — ἐν σοφαῖς ᾠδαῶν σωεισ-
ελύσει — ἐν αἰνίγμασι ᾠδαῶν ἀνασφαθήσει. Cap. xxxix.
§ 1, 2, 3.

presents them, and that their Obscurity arose from their having *typical* or *allegorical Intentions*; which Figures too related not to the *present*, but to a *future* Dispensation, as is farther seen from what *Ezekiel* says in another Place:—*Son of Man, Behold they of the House of Israel say, THE VISION THAT HE SEETH IS FOR MANY DAYS TO COME, AND HE PROPHESIETH OF THE TIMES THAT ARE FAR OFF* ^P. So that those People to whom the Prophecies were so *plain*, and who understood them to respect their own Times only, *without any typical or allegorical Meaning*, complain of *Obscurities*, and consider them as referring to very *remote Times*. But I am ashamed to dwell so long on so evident a Truth: The *English Bible* lies open to every Free-thinker of *Great Britain*, where they may read it that will, and understand it that can.

As for such Writers as the Author of the *Grounds and Reasons*, to say the Truth, one would never wish to see them otherwise employed; but when so great and good a Man as GROTIUS has unwarily contributed to the Dotages of Infidelity, this is such a Misadventure as one cannot regard but with the utmost Pity and Concern.

This excellent Person, for it is not to be disguised, has made it his constant Endeavour throughout his whole Comment on the Prophets, to find a *double* Sense even in those *direct* Prophecies which relate to JESUS; and to turn the primary Sense upon the Affairs of the *Jewish* Dispensation, allowing them to relate to JESUS only in a *secondary*; and by that affected Strain of Criticism, has done almost as much Harm to Revelation as his other Writings have done it Service: Not for any Strength there is in his Interpretations; for this and his Comment on

the *Apocalypse* are the Opprobrium of his great Learning, but only for the Name they carry with them. I am the freer in my Censure, because I can prove what I say.

The Principle *Grotius* went upon in commenting the Bible, was, that it should be interpreted on the same Rules of Criticism that Men use in the Study of all other ancient Writings. Nothing could be more just or reasonable than his Principle, but unluckily he deceived himself in the *Application*. These Rules teach us that the GENIUS, PURPOSE, and AUTHORITY of the Writer should be first carefully studied. Under the Head of his *Authority* it is to be considered whether he be a mere *human* or *inspired* Writer. Thus far *Grotius* went right; he examined that *Authority*, and pronounced the Writings to be *inspired*, and the Prophecies *divine*: But when he came to apply this Conclusion, he utterly forgot himself, and interpreted the Prophecies by Rules very different from what the Confession of their divine Original required. For seeing them pronounced by *Jewish* Prophets, occupied in *Jewish* Affairs, he concluded their only Object was *Jewish* Affairs, and consequently that the proper Sense of the Prophecies referred to them. But this was falling back from one of the Grounds he went upon, that the Writers were *inspired*; for this Interpretation was only reasonable, on a Supposition that the *Jewish* Prophets prophesied in that very Manner the Pagans understood theirs sometimes to have done, by a *natural Sagacity of Soul*: For, on the Allowance of *Inspiration*, God, and not the *Writer*, was the proper Author of the Prophecy; and to understand *his Purpose*, which the Rules of Interpretation require us to seek, we must examine the Nature, Reason, and End of the Religion he gave the *Jews*: For, on *these* common Sense tells us the Meaning of the Prophecies

must be intirely regulated. Now if, on Enquiry, it should be found, that this which *Grotius* admitted for a divine Dispensation, was only preparatory of one more perfect, it would then appear not improbable but that some of these Prophecies might relate, in their *literal, primary, and immediate* Sense, to that more perfect Dispensation. And whether they did so or no was to be determined by the *joint Evidence* of the Context, and of the Nature of the whole of God's Dispensation to Mankind, so far forth as it is discoverable to us. But *Grotius*, instead of making the Matter thus reasonably *problematical*, and to be determined by Evidence, *determined first*, and laid it down as a kind of Principle, that the Prophecies related directly and properly to *Jewish* Affairs; and into this System wiredrew all his Explanations. Now this, as we say, was *falsely* applying a *true* Rule of Interpretation. — He went on this reasonable Ground, that the Prophecies should be interpreted like all other ancient Writings; and, on examining their *Authority*, he found them to be truly *divine*. When he had gone thus far, he then preposterously went back again, and writ as if they were confessed to have been merely *human*: The Consequence was, that several of his Criticisms, to speak of them as only the Performance of a Man of Learning, are so forced, unnatural, and absurd, so contradictory to the rational Canon of Interpretation, that I will venture to say they are, in all Respects, the worst that ever came from the Hand of an acute and able Critic.

III.

Having now proved that the Principles Mr. *Collins* went upon, were in *themselves* false and extravagant, we have little Reason to regard how he used them. But as this extraordinary Writer was
as

as great a Free-thinker in *Logic* as in *Divinity*, it may not be improper to shew the fashionable World what sort of Men they have chosen for their *Guides*, to lead them from their Religion, when they would no longer have any to direct them to it.

His Argument against what he calls *typical, allegorical*, but properly, *secondary* Senses, stands thus: — *Christianity* pretends to derive itself from *Judaism*. *JESUS* appeals to the religious Books of the *Jews* as prophesying of his Mission. None of these Prophecies can be understood of him but in a *typical, allegoric* Sense. Now that Sense is absurd and contrary to all scholastic Rules of Interpretation. *Christianity*, therefore, not being really predicted of in the *Jewish* Writings, is consequently false. — The contestable Proposition, on which the whole Argument rests, is, that *a typical or allegoric Sense is absurd, and contrary to all scholastic Rules of Interpretation*.

Would the Reader now believe that Mr. Collins himself has in this very Book given a thorough Confutation of his own Proposition? Yet this he has done, and, contrary too to his usual Way of Reasoning, in a very convincing Manner; by shewing, from the universal Practice of Antiquity, that a *typical or allegorical* Sense is agreeable to the logical, scholastic Rules of Interpretation. For he says, — “ Allegory was much in Use amongst the
 “ *Pagans*, being cultivated by many of the Philo-
 “ sopher's themselves as well as Theologers. By
 “ SOME AS THE METHOD OF DELIVERING DOC-
 “ TRINES; but by most as the Method of explain-
 “ ing away what, according to the Letter, ap-
 “ pear'd absurd in the ancient Fables or Histories
 “ of their Gods. Religion itself was deemed a
 “ mysterious Thing amongst the *Pagans*, and not

“ to be publicly and plainly declared. Wherefore
 “ it was never simply represented to the People,
 “ but was most obscurely delivered, and veil’d un-
 “ der Allegories, or Parables, or Hieroglyphics;
 “ and especially amongst the *Egyptians, Chaldeans,*
 “ and the *Oriental Nations* — They allegorized
 “ many Things of Nature, and particularly the
 “ Heavenly Bodies — They allegorized all their
 “ ancient Fables and Stories, and pretended to dis-
 “ cover in them the Secrets of natural Philosophy,
 “ Medicine, Politicks, and in a word all Arts and
 “ Sciences. The Works of *Homer* in particular
 “ have furnished infinite Materials for all Sorts of
 “ allegorical Commentators to work upon — The
 “ ancient *Greek Poets* were reputed to involve di-
 “ vine, and natural, and historical Notions of their
 “ Gods under mystical and parabolical Expressions
 “ — The *Pythagorean Philosophy* was wholly de-
 “ livered in mystical Language, the Signification
 “ whereof was entirely unknown to the World
 “ abroad — The *Stoic Philosophers* are particularly
 “ famous for allegorizing the whole heathen Theo-
 “ logy — We have several Treatises of heathen
 “ Philosophers on the Subject of allegorical Inter-
 “ pretation^a. —”

If now this kind of *Allegorizing*, which involved
 the Proposition in a *double Sense*, was in Use
 amongst the Pagan Oracles, Divines, Philosophers
 and Poets, is not the Understanding ancient Writ-
 ings *allegorically*, or in a *double Sense*, agreeable to
 all rational, *scholastic* Rules of Interpretation? Surely,
 as much as understanding mere *metaphorical* Expres-
 sions in a tropical Signification, whose Propriety no
 one ever yet called in Question. For the Sense of
Propositions is imposed as arbitrarily as the Sense of

^a *Grounds, &c.* p. 83, 84, 85, 86.

Words. And if Men, in the Communication of their Thoughts, agree to give, on some Occasions, a *double* Sense to *Propositions*, as well, as on others a *single*, the interpreting the first in *two* Meanings is as agreeable to all *scholastic* Rules, as interpreting the second in *one*: And *Propositions* with a double and single Sense, are as easily distinguishable from each other, by the Help of the Context, as *Words* with a *literal* and figurative Meaning. But this great Philosopher seems to have imagined, that the *single* Sense of a *Proposition* was imposed by Nature; and that, therefore, giving them a *double* Meaning was the same Offence against Reason as the deviating from pure *Theism* into *Polytheism*: And, consequently, that the universal Lapse into *Allegory* and *Idolatry* rendered neither the one nor other of them the less absurd.

I say, he *seems* to think so; more one cannot say of such a Writer. Besides he *seems* to think otherwise, where, in another Place, as if aware that *Use* would rescue a *double* Sense from his *irrational* and *unscholastic* Censure, he endeavours to prove, that the *Jews*, during the Prophetic Period, did not use this allegoric Way of Expression. Now if we be right in this last Conjecture about his Meaning, he abuses the Terms he employs, under a miserable Quibble; and, by *scholastic* and *unscholastic* Rules, only means interpreting in a *single* or a *double* Sense.

The Reader perhaps will be curious to know how it happened, that this great Reasoner should, all at once, overthrow what he had been so long labouring to build. The fatal Issue of his GROUNDs and SCHEMES had two Causes:

I. He had a pressing and immediate *Objection* to remove. And as he had no great Stock of Argument, and but small Forecast, at a Plunge any Thing

Thing would be acceptable that came to his Relief.

The Objection was this — “That the allegorical Interpretations of the Apostles were not designed for absolute Proofs of *Christianity*, but for Arguments *ad hominem* only to the *Jews*, who were accustomed to that Way of Reasoning.” — Thus, as he himself tells us, some *Divines* are accustomed to talk. He gives them indeed a thorough Answer, but he dreams not of the Consequence. He says, this *allegoric Reasoning* was common to all Mankind. Was it so? Then the grand Proposition on which his whole Book rests, is entirely overthrown. For if all Mankind used it, the Method must needs be *rational* and *scholastic*. But this he was not aware of. What kept him in the Dark, was his never being able to distinguish between the Use and the ABUSE of this Mode of Information. These two Things he perpetually confounds: *The Pagan Oracles delivered themselves in Allegories*; — this was the Use: *Their later Divines turned all their Religion into Allegory*; — this was the Abuse. *The elder Pythagoreans gave their Precepts in Allegory*; — this was the Use: — *The later Stoics allegorized every Thing*; — this was the Abuse. *Homer had some Allegories*; — this was the Use: — *His Commentators turned all to Allegory*; — and this again was the Abuse.

2. But the other Cause of the Subversion of his System was his dear Delight in *Blackening*. He supposed, we may be sure, it would prove an effectual discredit to *Revelation*, when it was seen there was such a Conformity between the *Pagan Method* of delivering Religion and Morality, and the *Jewish*.

This silly Attempt has been already exposed as it deserves^s. But in this Instance it labours under much additional Folly. For the *different* Reasons that induced the Propagators of Paganism, and the Author of *Judaism* to employ the *same* Method of Information, are obvious to the meanest Understanding. The Pagans did it to hide the Weakness and Absurdities of their national Religions; the Author of *Judaism*, to prepare its Followers for the Reception of a more perfect Dispensation, founded on *that* which was preparatory of it; and yet, at the same Time, to prevent their immature Forsaking *that*, under which they were still to be long exercised.

Thus we see how this formidable Enemy of our Faith has himself overturned his whole Argument by an unwary Answer to an occasional Objection. But this is but one, of a Book full of Contradictions. I have no Occasion to be particular after removing his main Principles; yet, for the Reader's Diversion, I shall give him a Sample of them. In his 81. page he says—*And there has been for a long Time, and is at this Time as little Use of Allegory in those Respects amongst them [the Jews] as there seems to have been during the Time the Books of the Old Testament were written, which seem the most plain of all ancient Writings, and wherein there appears not the least Trace of a Typical or Allegorical Intention in the Authors, or in any other Jews of their Times.* Yet it is but at the 85 Page that we find him saying—*And in this [viz. in delivering his Philosophy in mystical Language] PYTHAGORAS came up to SOLOMON's Character of wise Men, who dealt in dark Sayings, and acted not much unlike the most divine*

^s See Book iv. § 1. at the End.

Teacher that ever was. Our Saviour spake with many Parables, &c. Now it seems, it was Solomon's Character of wise Men that they dealt in dark Sayings. But these wise Men were the Authors of the Jewish Books. And yet he had but just before assured us, That the Books of the Old Testament seem the most plain of all ancient Writings, and wherein there appears not the least Trace of a Typical or Allegorical Intention in the Authors, or in any Jews of their Times.

Again, in his 85--6. Pag. he says, "The Pythagorean Philosophy was wholly delivered in mystical Language; the Signification whereof was intirely unknown to the World abroad, and but gradually explained to those of the Sect, as they grew into Years, or were proper to be informed — The Stoic Philosophers were particularly famous for *allegorizing* — We have several Treatises of Heathen Philosophers on the Subject of Allegorical Interpretation — And from Philosophers, *Platonists* and *Stoics*, the famous *Origen* is said to have derived a great deal of his Skill in allegorizing the Books of the Old Testament. This he says, and yet at the 94 Pag. he tells us, — "That the Apostles, and particularly *St. Paul*, wholly discarded all other Methods of Reasoning used by Philosophers, except the *Allegorical*: and set that up as the true and ONLY Reasoning proper to bring all Men to the Faith of CHRIST: and the Gentiles were to be WHOLLY beat out of the literal Way of arguing, and to argue as *became Jews*. And the Event of preaching the Gospel has been suited to Matters considered in this View and Light. For we know that the WISE did not receive the Gospel at first, and that they were the latest Converts; *Which PLAINLY arose from*
" *their*

“ *their using Maxims of reasoning and disputing*
 “ WHOLLY Opposite to those of Christians.” By
 these *Wise*, can be meant none but the Pagan Phi-
 losophers: yet these, according to our Author, were
 altogether given up to Mystery and Allegory. And
 yet St. *Paul*, and the rest of the Apostles, who, he
 says, were likewise given up to the same Method,
 could make no Converts amongst these *wise Men*.
 Why? It would now methinks have suited his own
 Sense, as well as Temper, to have said, *because two*
of a Trade could not agree: No, says this incom-
 parable Critic, *it was because the Philosophers used*
Maxims of reasoning and disputing wholly opposite to
the Christians.

What now but the Name and Authority of *Free-
 thinking* could hinder such a Writer's becoming the
 Contempt of all who know either how to make, or
 to understand an Argument? These Men profane
 the *Light* they receive from *Revelation* in employing
 it to rob the Treasures of the *Sanctuary*. But see the
 Fate that attends them all, in the inseparable Con-
 nexion between Impiety and Blundering. *Esop*
 seems to have ALLEGORIZED their Destiny in the
 Fable of the Thief, who lighted his Candle at the
 Altar of *Jupiter* in order to plunder the Temple.
 But RELIGION arrested him in the very Act, and
 pronounced this Sentence on his whole Race,

“ — Ne IGNIS NOSTER facinori præluceat,
 “ Per quem colendos censuit Pietas Deos,
 “ VETO ESSE TALE LUMINIS COMMERCIIUM^t.

If it be asked then what it is that has so strangely
 prejudiced our modern Reasoners against this an-
 cient Mode of Information by *typical* and *secondary*

^t *Phæd.* l. iv. Fab. 10.

Senses? I answer, the Folly of some Fanatics, who have abused it to the most abominable Nonsense. But how unreasonable is this Prejudice! Was there ever any Thing rational or excellent amongst Men that hath not been thus abused? Is it any Disparagement of the *Method* of Geometers, that whimsical Writers on Morality and Religion have of late taken it up to give an Air of Sobriety and Demonstration to the Flights of an extravagant Fancy? Is there no Truth of Nature, or Reasonableness of Art, in *grammatical Construction*, because cabalistic Dunces have, in every Age, abused it to pervert all human Meaning? — We might as well say the ancient *Egyptians* did not write in *Hieroglyphics*, because *Kircher*, who endeavoured to explain them, has given us nothing but his own Visions; as that the ancient *Jews* had not *Types* and *secondary Senses*, because modern Enthusiasts have allegorized their whole History.

But from these *Abuses* I draw a very contrary Conclusion. The Extravagance of *allegorizing* in Religion has infected all Ages: A plain Proof that the original Mode was founded in the common Conception of Mankind. The *Pagans* began the Abuse, and the pestilent Infection soon spread amongst the Followers of *true Revelation*.

1. The early Propagators of PAGANISM, in order to hide the Weakness of the national Religion, delivered many Things in Types and Allegories. But a growing Superstition, accompanied with an equal Advance in Knowledge, made it at length impossible to hide the Folly of the other Parts, even from common Observers. Their Successors therefore, to support its Credit, went on where the others had left off; and allegorized all the traditional Stories of their Gods to natural, moral, and divine Entities.

Entities. This, notwithstanding the Extravagance of the *Means*, fully answered the *End*.

2. The *Jews* ingrafted on their Predecessors, just as the *Pagans* had done on *theirs*; and with the same worldly Policy: For being possessed with a national Prejudice, That their Religion was given for Perpetuity, and yet seeing in it the Marks of a carnal, temporary, and preparatory Dispensation, they cunningly allegorized its *Rites* and *Precepts* into a *spiritual* Meaning, which covered all the real Deficiencies arising from this its imaginary Nature. Both these Sets of *Allegorists* therefore, had Reason in their Madness.

3. Afterwards came a Set of CHRISTIAN Writers, brought out from amongst *Jews* and *Gentiles*; and these too, would needs be in the Fashion, and allegorize *their* Religion. But with infinitely less Judgment. In these Hands the *End* proved as hurtful as the *Means* were extravagant. And how should it be otherwise in a Religion *divine* and *perfect*? For in such an one there was nothing either to HIDE or to SUPPLY. We have shewn that *Types* and *secondary Senses* were employed in the *Jewish* Religion for the *sake of the Christian*, of which it was the Ground and Preparation. When therefore the *Christian* was come, these Modes of Information must cease of course, there being no farther Occasion, nor, indeed, Room for them. As clear as this is to the commonest Understanding, yet would some *primitive Doctors* of the Church needs vie with *Jewish Rabbins*, and *Pagan Philosophers*, in all the Rage of *Allegorizing*: Deaf to the Voice of Reason, which called aloud to tell them, that those very Arguments, which proved there were, and must needs be *Types* and *secondary Senses* in the *Old Testament*, proved as plainly that there neither were,
nor

nor could be any in the *New*. Thus, to the inexpressible Damage of *Christianity*, they exposed a *reasonable Service*, a *perfected Dispensation*, where nothing was taught but Truth, plain, simple, and open, to the Laughter and Contempt of Infidels; who, bewildered in the universal *Maze* of this *Allegoric Mode* of Information, were never able to know what it was in its Original, or how to distinguish between the *Use* and the *Abuse*.

TO CONCLUDE, let not the Reader think we have been all this while leading him out of the Way, while we have engaged his Attention to the *Book of Job*, to the *Case of Abraham*, and to *Types and secondary Senses* under the *Jewish Dispensation*. All these strictly belong to our main Argument:

1. First, as they greatly contribute to shew the *Harmony* of Truth; and how all the Parts of the *Jewish Dispensation* support and illustrate one another.

2. Secondly, as they contribute to shew the *Uniformity* of it; and how the Holy Spirit, quite throughout God's grand Oeconomy, from his first giving the *Law* to the Completion of it by the *Gospel*, observed the same unvaried Method of the GRADUAL COMMUNICATION OF TRUTH.

3. Thirdly, as they contribute to shew, that those who contend that the *Christian Doctrine* of a future State was revealed to the early *Jews*, destroy all Reason of a *secondary Sense* of Prophecies (yet of how great Importance the Reality of *this Sense* of Prophecies is to the Truth of *Christianity* has been largely explained:) For how can it be known with Certainty, from the Prophecies themselves, that they contain *double Senses*, but from hence, that the *old Law* was preparatory to, and the Rudiments of

of the *new*? How shall *this* Relation be certainly known, but from hence, that *no* future State of Rewards and Punishments is to be found in the *Mosaic* Dispensation? So close a Dependence have all these momentous Principles on one another.

4. I had a farther Reason for the Dissertation on *Types and secondary Senses*. For as I have shewn that a future State of Rewards and Punishments was revealed under the *Jewish* Dispensation no otherwise than by those Modes of Information, it was necessary, in order to shew the real Connexion between the two Religions, *Jewish* and *Christian*, to prove those Modes to be Logical and Rational. For, as on the one hand, had the Doctrine of Life and Immortality been clearly revealed under the *Jewish* Oeconomy, it had been *more* than the *Rudiment and Preparation* for the *Christian*; so, had no Intimations at all been given, it had been *less*: That is, the Dependency and Connexion between the two Religions had not been sufficiently marked out and ascertained.

We have now proved our three principal Propositions,

I. “That the inculcating the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, is necessary to the well being of Civil Society.”

II. “That all Mankind, especially the most wise and learned Nations of Antiquity, have concurred in Believing, and Teaching, that this Doctrine was of such Use to Civil Society.”

III. “That the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments is not to be found in, nor did make Part of the *Mosaic* Dispensation.”

The next Volume is employed in deducing our Conclusion, THAT THEREFORE THE LAW OF MOSES IS OF DIVINE ORIGINAL; and in endeavouring

deavouring to establish it, by the Removal of all Objections; and by supporting it with one general View of the whole Course of God's grand Oeconomy, from *Adam* to CHRIST: Which Disposition of the Work hath afforded us an Opportunity of giving a View of the true Nature of PAGAN Religion in the *first* Volume; of the JEWISH in the *second*; and of the CHRISTIAN, in the *third* and last.

The End of the SIXTH Book.



A N
A P P E N D I X:

Containing, Some
R E M A R K S

On a Book, intituled,
*Future Rewards and Punishments be-
lieved by the ANCIENTS, particularly the
PHILOSOPHERS; wherein some Objections
of the Reverend Mr. WARBURTON, in his
Divine Legation of MOSES, are considered.*

Beware lest any Man spoil you through PHILOSOPHY and
vain Deceit, after the Traditions of Men, after the
Rudiments of the World, and not after CHRIST.
Col. ii. 8.

The SECOND EDITION.

ADVERTISEMENT

To this SECOND EDITION.

THE Author of the Pamphlet here examined hath lately made a public Confession of his Authorship, signed with his own *Name*; and thereby saved himself from all farther Correction of this kind. For he who is so lost to Shame, as a WRITER, to *own* what he before wrote, and so lost to Shame, as a MAN, to *own* what he hath now written, must needs be past all Amendment, the only reasonable View in *Correction*. I shall therefore but do, what indeed (were it any more than repeating what he himself hath discovered to the Public) would be justly reckoned the cruelest of all things, tell my Reader the Name of this Miserable; which we find to be I. TILLARD.

APPENDIX.

REMARKS.

I.

TH O' I could not persuade myself to take this Notice of such a kind of Writer as him of the *Miscellany*, yet a very little thing, the Reader sees, will engage me to give an Adversary Satisfaction; while I suffer myself to be seduced into a Controversy by the Writer of a late Book, intituled, *Future Rewards and Punishments believed by the Ancients, particularly the Philosophers; wherein some Objections of the Reverend Mr. Warburton in his Divine Legation of MOSES, are considered* *.

And a very little Thing it was; only the finding in his Book one single Truth, which does me a Piece of Justice, that the *orthodox* Writer above-mentioned would by no means be brought unto, even after his Conviction of Calumny on that Head. It is in these Words: *But I must here do so much Justice to Mr. Warburton, as to acknowledge, that the Point he denies, is, that the Philosophers only did not believe future Rewards and Punishments; whereas he allows all others did believe them* ^a.

For the rest, neither his *Abilities* nor his *Candour* deserved this Notice. His *Abilities* are duly celebrated in

* 8^{vo}, London, 1740. Printed by M. Steen, in the Inner-Temple Lane.

^a p. 84.

these few Sheets; and for his *Candour*, the Reader will, I believe, require no farther Proof than the following: — *After all these lively Descriptions — if there can the least Doubt remain in the Reader's Breast — it must arise from the Influence and Prepossession of a few random Expressions now and then thrown out to depreciate the Philosophers, by certain Persons, who, thinking themselves obliged to say something out of the common Road, very frequently discover their IGNORANCE AND WANT OF SENSE IN THE VERY ATTEMPT TO DISPLAY THEIR LEARNING: But that SUCH PRETENDERS TO KNOWLEDGE, SUCH EMPTY MIMICS OF REAL WORTH, MAY NO LONGER IMPOSE upon Persons of good Understanding — I shall, &c.*^b.

But tho' I shew this Distinction to a puny Truth half overlaid, which I was forced to draw from under an unwieldy Heap of Blunders and Prevarications: yet, let it be observed, that this is only for once, and out of due Regard to the first Writer against me, that has condescended to say any thing truly of me: For I hope common Honesty is not so rare, even *amongst Answerers by Profession* (of all sober Knaves the most corrupt) that this Tribute need be paid twice unto it.

My Considerer begins his Preface thus: *The Motive which principally induced me to publish the following Collection and Observations, was the strange and unjustifiable Methods which some Men take to advance their own SYSTEMS by depreciating and running down those of others*^c. The Reader sees what the Man would be at. Here's no Disguise or Reserve however. 'Tis the old Infidel Grudge against the intolerant Spirit of Christianity, delivered as crudely as ever his dear Friends, the *Philosophers*, urged it against the *primitive Apologists*. Their great Quarrel to Christianity was, that its Defenders endeavoured to advance their own Systems, by depreciating and running down those of others^d: And this, in their, and in their Advocates Opinion, was a strange and unjustifiable Method. And how should he think otherwise? when he has so mean an Opinion of the Cause of Revelation, as to tell us presently after, That most of that vast number of Books that have

^b p. 164, 5. ^c p. iii. ^d See the *D. L.* Vol. I. p. 290—4.

been wrote to prove the Necessity and Excellency of our holy Religion, are thought very mean and insufficient by the unprejudiced and inquisitive Adversary, but appear in a very different Light to the Mob of Christians, who, by the happy Prejudice of Education, have been brought up to doubt of nothing. But hear him in his own more emphatic Words: *The vast number of Books and Pamphlets which have of late Years been so plentifully poured out, to prove the Necessity and Excellency of our holy Religion, certainly deserve the Approbation and Thanks of every zealous and truly devout Christian: And tho' many of these Performances have been* THOUGHT BY THE ADVERSARY VERY MEAN AND INSUFFICIENT, *yet they have appeared in a quite different Light in the Eyes of the Bulk of Mankind; WHO FROM THE HAPPY CAST OF THEIR NATIVITY, HAVE, IN THEIR EARLIEST AGE, BEEN TAUGHT TO FORM A MUCH BETTER JUDGMENT OF THINGS; AND WHO, SELDOM HAVING ANY DOUBTS OR SCRUPLES TO DISTURB THEM, are therefore the easier confirmed in the quiet and full Persuasion of these Doctrines* THEY AT FIRST RECEIVED^e.

Had I not Reason to say as I did, " That the Heathen Philosophers of our Times might be well excused in being angry to see their ancient Brethren shewn for Knaves in Practice, and Fools in Theory; but that any else should think themselves concerned in the Force and Fidelity of the Drawing, was a Mystery I did not know what to make of^f ?"

It is therefore Matter of much Consolation to me, to find that the real Friends of Revelation have at length left these *Heathen Philosophers* (the Men whom only it concerns) to dispute this Point with me. I have now got a *Gentleman Freethinker* under my Hands; and, if those other Folks will be but easy, I'll promise to give a good Account of him.

Our *Considerer* proceeds to shew the Reasons why some Defenders of Christianity will not acknowledge the Doctrine contained in his Book. He graciously acquits them of all Malice and Design, and throws it first,

^e p. iii, iv.

^f D. L. Vol. I. Edit. 2. p. 437.

1. Upon their Ignorance. *The first of which is the Ignorance, in this particular, of by far the greatest Part of them [Defenders of Christianity] who really do not know that Rewards and Punishments in another Life are any where spoken of but in the New Testament, unless it be in some dark and figurative Terms, which (AS IF THERE WERE NONE SUCH AMONGST THEMSELVES) they think they have a Right to laugh at and expose. They remember, perhaps, some Stories in their School-books of Elysium, of Tartarus, of Cerberus, &c. and conclude, very hastily, that this was all that was ever thought of or believed by the Heathens concerning a World to come^s. It was not for nothing, we find, that he despised the Defenders of Christianity as Scribblers, whom none but a prejudic'd Mob would give any Credit to: For the far greatest Part of them, it seems, knew no more of Antiquity than a few Stories in their School-books. But who can enough admire the Modesty of this, in one, who confesses he has forgot his Greek, and this only in order to insinuate that he has some Latin which yet sticks by him?*

2. He throws it, *Secondly*, Upon their Prejudices, that is, *their great Attachment to their own Religion. On this Head, he talks I don't know what——of captivated Lovers, — pious Zeal, — Prejudice of Education, — Interest, Pre-ferment; in short, the common Dog-trot of Infidelity and Freethinking.*

After this Specimen of his *Modesty*, he presents us with one of his *Abilities*. *As to what relates (says he) to the Subject of the following Sheets, the Case in Fact is this. It is indisputably true, and beyond all reasonable Contradiction, that the Doctrine of future Rewards and Punishments is clearly and plainly delivered and laid down in the New Testament: And it is as indisputably true, and beyond all reasonable Contradiction, that the Doctrine of future Rewards and Punishments IS CLEARLY AND PLAINLY DELIVERED AND LAID DOWN in the Books and Writings of the Heathens. THE TRUTH OF WHICH POINT is now submitted to the Judgment of every impartial Reader^h. This indisputable Point, which he writes a Book to prove, is, I believe, strictly so. At least it was never disputed by*

^s p. v.

^h p. vii.

his humble Servant. On the contrary, I have said, the Heathen Philosophers were perpetually inculcating to the People the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments in their Discourses and Writingsⁱ. But his Title Page professes to prove the Truth of a very different Point, not quite so indisputable. Future Rewards and Punishments BELIEVED by the Ancients, particularly the Philosophers, wherein some Objections of the Reverend Mr. W. in his Divine Legation of MOSES are considered. Thus we see this able Writer has mistaken his Question before he be got to the End of his Preface. *Diòs me de contiènda con quièn me entienda*, says the Spanish Proverb, God grant me an Adversary that understands me. But, wretch that I am, after having never met with such an Adversary, I am now forced to contend with one that does not understand himself.

His Preface concludes thus: *I thought once to have changed the Order in which the Quotations of the second Chapter are placed.* BUT METHOD IN SUCH CASES DEPENDING ALMOST AS MUCH UPON THE FANCY OF EVERY READER AS THE REAL PROPRIETY OF THE THING ITSELF, *I chose rather to submit them as they are, &c.*^k. By these his frank Sentiments of *Method*, it appears, he has forgot his *Logic* too, if ever he had any, as well as his *Greek*, which, he tells us, *he had neglected, like Lord Chief Justice Hale, by a long Avocation to Studies of quite another Nature*^l. Whatever his Studies were, he can scarce persuade the Reader to think them like *Lord Chief Justice Hale's*. That Learned Man indeed lost his *Greek*, but got a great deal of good *Sense*. Our Author too has lost his *Greek*. And what has he got? Marry, the Knack of writing without any *Sense* at all.

II.

We come now to his *first Chapter*, the only one that I am concerned in; and therefore the only one I shall, at present, give myself the Trouble of considering. As just before he had innocently blundered out of the Question;

ⁱ D. L. Vol. I. p. 317, 318.

^k p. ix.

^l p. viii.

so now by entering on his Attendance on the Author of the *Divine Legation*, he has as innocently blundered into it: And thus has set all right again.

After having frankly told the Reader, that the Author of the *Divine Legation* had not the direct and immediate Discovery of Truth, and the REAL and SUBSTANTIAL Improvement of Mankind [*i. e.* the Recommendation of Pagan Philosophy] in his Thoughts and Studies, but the Advancement of a certain favourite Scheme^m [*i. e.* of Revelation] he goes on to ⁿ quote the Apologies I make for venturing to deny a commonly received Opinion. On which he thus descants: *By all which, and indeed his whole manner of treating this Subject, he plainly discovers such a great Distrust of his Arguments and Conclusions to convince the Judgment of his Reader, that, &c^o.* I am a very unlucky Writer. If I express myself with Confidence, I am supposed to distrust other Men's Opinions; if with Diffidence, my own. But let him rest himself content. I am under no manner of Diffidence. Or, if I had any, his writing against me had easily removed it. However, in this I shall never recriminate. I confess, he writes all the way as much without Fear as Wit.

I shall (says our crafty Advocate) *pass over his nice Distinctions, Divisions, and Subdivisions*^p. Now this, I cannot but think hard. He had before made his Exceptions to Greek, and I dare say he would think it unfair to have it urged against him after he had so fairly pleaded *Ignoramus* to it; yet a critical Use of that Language is alone sufficient to determine a decisive Question in this Controversy, namely of the *Spinozism* of the ancient Philosophers: And here he debars me all Benefit of Logic, and won't have Patience while I state the Question, and divide the Subject. *I shall pass over* (says he) *his nice Distinctions, Divisions, and Subdivisions*. So that because he knows neither Greek nor Method, I shall use none. Here then I might fairly dismiss this minute Philosopher, who dares me to the Combat, and yet excepts against all the Weapons in Use. But not to disappoint the Company we have brought together, I will accept his Challenge, and fight him with his own wooden Dagger.

^m p. 1, 2. ⁿ p. 2, 3. ^o p. 3. ^p *Ibid.*

I proceed (says he) directly to take notice of those Reasons which, IN MY APPREHENSION, any ways affect the present Question; and these, I think, may be reduced to two. 1st, "That the Philosophers held it lawful, for the public Good, to say one Thing, when they thought another, and that they actually did so. 2dly, That they held some fundamental Principles of Philosophy, which were altogether inconsistent with the Doctrine of future Rewards and Punishments ^a." But surely, if he will needs write against me, his Business is not only to consider what, in his Apprehension, tends to the Proof of my Point, but likewise what in my Apprehension I had said does so. For Instance, in his Apprehension, this Argument, That the Philosophers held it lawful in general to say one Thing, when they thought another, and this, that they actually did so, tends to the Proof of my Point. And, in my Apprehension, this other Argument likewise, That the Philosophers acted on the above Principle, with regard to a future State of Rewards and Punishments, the very Doctrine in question, has, at least, as strong a Tendency: For which Reason I had employed six large Pages to inforce it. But to all this my Adversary has thought fit to say—Nothing.

However, if he will needs confine the Strength of my Discourse to those two Points, I must be content, and accept the best Terms he can be brought to. Nor will the Reader perhaps think these bad ones. But alas! he yet knows little of our Advocate. Of a hundred Arguments from Reason and Authority which support those two Points, he has not ventured so much as at a Decimation; and his Attack of those few he shuffles off in so evasive a manner, as would never get him Victory in the Schools^r, nor hardly Credit at the Bar. But what would he not do, or what would he not forbear to do for his Philosophers? For if that Set of modern Heathens, as he gravely tells us, ARE NOT FAR FROM THE KINGDOM OF GOD, who being really in good earnest in the Search of Truth, have without Prejudice considered, and have calmly, seriously, and with the utmost Diligence examined into the Obligation of the several Religions, or Sects of Religion which now prevail in

^a P. 3, 4.

^r P. 3.

the World; and after the maturest Deliberation are satisfied there is nothing extraordinary or immediately divine in any of them; but that, upon the Whole, all which they contain or pretend to (except what relates to our Duty to God, and our Obligations to Morality) is merely human Invention, and the Product of Design, of Error, or of Enthusiasm. If these be so near Day, in what a hopeful Condition are those of the *elder House*, who certainly cannot be said to have rejected the Gospel; tho' so ready to give a *diligent and dispassionate Examination* to any thing that would afford room for a Dispute.

III.

But we must take him as we find him, and be thankful. The Reader will say presently we have Reason. For he now proceeds to the Confutation of the first Point, *That the Philosophers held it lawful, for public Good, to say one Thing, when they thought another.* And how does he set about it? truly in a very new Way. By PROVING it at large, from the fourth to the sixteenth Page: Which, he *honestly*, for the *second Time*, concludes thus. *All which is, in Effect, no more than what Mr. Warburton himself says.* Why, no; but he being able to say it so much better, had a Mind to shew his Parts. And now, according to his own Confession, *the Philosophers holding it lawful, for the public Good, to say one thing when they thought another;* and I having proved, to which Proof he has not opposed a single Syllable, *that they practised this Rule in the very Point in Question,* the Dispute is fairly at an End. This will certainly surprize our less attentive Readers: But they must know, all this good-natur'd Pains was neither for their Sakes nor for mine, but for his dear *Philosophers*. The Case stood thus: When I spoke of the *double Doctrine*, I considered the Practice of it as not altogether free from Blame. Not that this Representation contributed to prove it practised in the Point in question, but because I thought the Representation *true*. But my Adversary, as we see, having taken it for granted, that *I had not the direct and immediate Discovery of TRUTH in my Thoughts and Studies*^u, had nothing left, but the first Reason to assign for my Representation, which affecting the Credit of his Masters,

^s p. 201—2.^t p. 16, 17.^u p. 1, 2.

he will endeavour, as great an Enemy as he is to *Divisions* and *Distinctions*, to *distinguish* away this Opprobrium. He therefore *divides* the Practice of the *double Doctrine* into two Sorts. The one, a little criminal: The other, quite free from Blame^w. And to shew his Judgment, in the first Class he places *Priests* and *Politicians*^x, and in the *second*, the *Chinese Literati*^y, who, taught Atheism in private; and *Orpheus*^z, who, against his Conscience, as he says, taught Polytheism in public. But the Class of Innocents, you may be sure, was erected chiefly for his dear Philosophers, whose *double Doctrine* he impiously compares to the Practices of the ever blessed *Jesus*^a. For which I remit him to the *appointed* Defenders of Religion: who will, I hope, give him due Correction for all his Insults on their *Ignorance* and their *School-Books*.

The mighty Argument then he labours with, and for the sake of which he has, before he was aware, given up the whole Cause, is this, "The Philosophers Practice of the *double Doctrine* was innocent and laudable: therefore it could never be employed to preach up a Future State of Rewards and Punishments in Public, and to preach it down in private." — This, I suppose, he would have said, had he known how to express his own Meaning. Let us see then what Force it has upon his Principles. For, as much as he contends for the Propagation of Truth, he is not likely to die a Martyr to it; as you may hear by his talking: — *To disturb the public Peace, to break the Laws, and fruitlessly to expose ourselves to manifest Danger for the sake of propagating our Religion, seems to carry a contradiction in itself, and would need no Confutation, if the mistaken Principles and Practice of a few Zealots did not inflame some People to think otherwise*^b. It is no wonder this should raise his Indignation. For had not *Christ* and his Apostles been guilty of the very Misdemeanor that, he tells us, *carries a contradiction in itself* (which, whatever it means in his Jargon, is surely something very bad) we had never had the poor Philosophers at this time of Day so disgracefully pushed

^w p. 7. ^x *Ibid.* ^y p. 12. ^z p. 13, 14. ^a p. 30--39. ^b p. 43.

beside the Chair. But for this, I again send him to be disciplined by the *Defenders* aforesaid; and go on to try his Argument on his own Principle. *The Philosophers*, as he confesses, *used, for the public good, to say one thing when they thought another.* They saw that the Doctrine of a Future State of Rewards and Punishments was firmly believed by the People, and of infinite Service to Society. But their speculative Opinions led them to reject it. What was to be done? Telling what they thought the Truth would be injurious, on the Supposition, both to Society and themselves. And (as he assures us) *fruitlessly to expose ones self to manifest Danger for the sake of propagating ones Religion, seems to carry a Contradiction in itself.* Here then their Principle of *saying one thing when they thought another*, came in Practice, nothing being left, but to *profess* in public, and *believe* in private. But he will say, perhaps, *that sincere impartial Inquirers after Truth*, like his Philosophers, could not, *after the most careful Examination*, reject the Doctrine of future Rewards and Punishments. Why not, I ask him? They might be as costive of Belief, for ought he knows, as his favourite Class of Free-thinkers; who, with the same Qualifications, reject all Revelation in general. But it ran strangely in his Head, that if I thought the Philosophers practised the double Doctrine on the Point in question, I must needs suppose they had *no fixed Principles.*—But it is very unreasonable (says he) and unjust from hence to conclude, that they who do so, have no Belief of their own, or that they think all Religion whatever the Invention of designing Men^c. And again——So that notwithstanding their double Doctrine, they had still some fixed ones of their own^d. Why thou mighty Defender of Heathen Wisdom! who ever said they had not! Or who but *such* a Defender would not have seen, that all the force of my Argument rests upon this very Truth, that they had *fixed Principles*, that they had a *Belief of their own*?

But as if he had not done enough in this obliging way, he will go on, and prove for me, that *the double Doctrine was not about different Opinions, but the same.* I indeed

^c P. 45.

^d P. 47.

thought it incumbent on *me* to shew this: because it was bringing my Argument home to the Point, that a Future State was one of the Objects of the *double Doctrine*. But how it could be made to serve *his* Purpose, was quite beyond by reach. Judge then of my Surprise, when I saw him attempt to prove it at large; and to conclude his Proof thus. *It appears then that the external Doctrine related to the same thing as the internal^e.* I was some time at a loss for his Meaning in the former Case: but here I gave over the Search as desperate. Not but I concluded there was Mischief somewhere. At last I found this slender thing of an Argument lie lurking under a *Comundrum*. I don't know whether it will bear the handling; but at present it hangs together thus: "The external Doctrine related to the same thing as the internal. Now a *Future State* is one thing, and *no Future State*, another. These therefore being *two*, could not be the Object of the *double Doctrine*, which was concerned with *one* thing only." But our Advocate is so far from being able to make a good Argument, that, to the Shame of his *Profession*, he knows not how to make a good *Quibble*. For I had all along affirmed the Philosophers, both in their *external* and *internal* teaching, held a *Future State* (here's his *one and the same thing* for him:) In their *external*, a Future State with Rewards and Punishments; in their *internal*, a Future State without them.

But tho' he contends, that *the external Doctrine related to the same thing with the internal*, yet it does not (he says) in the least appear, that the Philosophers believed one thing, and taught a quite contrary to the People^f. This is strange indeed. These Philosophers then must be like their Advocate, and teach *nothing*. Otherwise, if the external Teaching was for the People, and the internal what the People could not be trusted with, and both about the same thing, the two Ways of Teaching must certainly proceed upon contrary Propositions. But, perhaps, in the Humour he is now in, an Authority may be better liked than a Reason. I will give him one above all Exception: His own. In another Place he tells us, *it did fully appear, that the Philosophers believed one thing, and taught a quite*

^e p. 24.

^f p. 19.

contrary to the People; for he says — THE EXTERNAL THEREFORE MUST BE JUST THE REVERSE [to the internal] WITH RELATION TO THE SAME POINTS §.

IV.

Our Advocate hath given me so little room to quarrel with him on this Head, that the Reader must needs have had a very poor and meagre Entertainment. Nothing but a still-born Blunder, and the Ghost of a departed Quibble. He must therefore be content to make out his Treat with what cold Scraps I can pick up from the over-sodden *Crambe* of his *Logic* and *Literature*.

In the fifth Page he says, Mr. Warburton EXPRESSES himself very AMBIGUOUSLY, where he asserts that they held it lawful, for the public good, to say one thing when they thought another. FOR, in the present Question, if we understand by this, that the Philosophers believed a Future State in a spiritual, refined, and rational Sense, while they sometimes countenanced the People in their gross, vulgar, and corporeal Notions of it, then what he lays down is certainly true: But if we understand it, AS HE INTENDS WE SHOULD, that the Philosophers preached the Doctrine of a Future State to the People, while themselves believed the contrary, viz. that there was no future State of Rewards and Punishments at all; then his Charge on the Philosophers is absolutely false.

The *Logic* of this incomparable Period stands thus:

1. First I talk *ambiguously*, BECAUSE it is in his Power to misunderstand me; for in the present Case (says he) if WE understand, &c. not because of any thing I myself said, or omitted to say. For when I asserted what he here lays to my Charge, I had added, that the Philosophers preached the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments to the People, while themselves believed the contrary; and repeated it so often over, that this Writer himself, who accuses me of *expressing myself ambiguously*, confesses, in the very Attempt to prove his Accusation, that he knows my Meaning. But if we understand it (says he) AS HE INTENDS WE SHOULD.——

2. Secondly, I talk *ambiguously*, BECAUSE, in his Sense of the Words, they are true, in mine, not true.

These are such Discoveries in the *Art of Reasoning*, that I could almost wish the Author would add a Chapter of *Ambiguities* to our common *Logics*. A thing I'll assure him very much wanted.

In his seventeenth Page we have these Words, *Notwithstanding which* [viz. the double-doctrine] *the Design and End of the Philosophers in both, was still in general the same, that is, to improve Mankind as much as they would bear; and the Doctrines in Substance and at the bottom were all along one and the same; JUST AS true Christianity MAY NOW BE, tho' in some Countries scarce discernible, being overwhelmed with Legends, false Miracles, Image-worship, and all the Trumpery of Popish Superstition.*

Here's a Period, let me tell you, that has no weak Side of *Sense*, but is impenetrable all round. Does he mean that the external and internal Doctrines of the Philosophers were in general the same, *just as pure Christianity, and corrupt Christianity overwhelmed with Legends, false Miracles, Image-worship, and all the Trumpery of Popish Superstition, are in general the same?* Or does he mean that the external and internal Doctrines of the Philosophers were both to improve Mankind as much as they could bear, *just as pure Christianity, and corrupt Christianity overwhelmed with Legends, false Miracles, Image-worship, and all the Trumpery of Popish Superstition, are both to improve Mankind as much as they can bear?* Or lastly, which perhaps should have been asked first, had he any Meaning at all? However it is every Way so profound, that I should advise him to add a Chapter of *Comparisons* to his Chapter of *Ambiguities*, that the one may furnish us with *Examples* to fit his *Rules* in the other. This shall suffice at present for a Specimen of his *Art of Reasoning*.

Let us turn to his *Literature*, and see first how he manages his *Latin Translations*.

He gives us the following Quotation from *Ælian's Various History*^a. *Ita vero etiam Socratem non explicite disse-*

^a l. 14. c. 15.

rere; *si quis autem eas Dissertationes CONVERTAT*, planissimas esse; and translates it thus: *Socrates used to talk ambiguously; but if any one turns and SIFTS his Discourses WITH ATTENTION, they will appear most plain and easy*ⁱ.

The Reader will seek to no Purpose in the Latin for *sifts with Attention*; but this was the Paraphrase of a Word he did not understand, *convertat*, *σέψει*, used by the Author in allusion to its *literal*, not *figurative* Sense. *Ælian* had just before told a Story of one, a *Connoisseur* like our Advocate, who would needs have a Horse painted rolling on his Back. The Artist brought him a running Horse; which not contenting him, the other put it into the Posture required, by turning the Picture upside down. Turn *Socrates* thus, says *Ælian*, and you have his true Meaning. That is, *understand him by Contraries*. And this Rule was given with Judgment. For *Socrates* being perpetually *ironical*, take him in the reverse, and he is in his right Senses. But our Advocate knew as little of *Socrates's* Character as of his Translator's Latin. "*Pausonem enim*
 "*Pictorem, quum audivisset a quodam, ut volutantem se e-*
 "*quum pingeret, currentem eum pinxisse. Quum igitur is*
 "*qui tabulam pingendam locarat, indignaretur, tanquam*
 "*contra pactum ille pinxisset, respondisse Pictorem, VERTE*
 "*[ὅτι σέψει] Tabulam, & ita volutans tibi esto Equus, qui*
 "*nunc est currens. Ita vero etiam Socratem non explicitè*
 "*differere; si quis autem eas Dissertationes CONVERTAT*
 "*[σέψει] planissimas esse."* Let us now see how ably he
 "acquits himself of his Original Writers.

He brings a Passage from *Macrobius* in these Words, *Si quid de his assignare conantur, quæ non sermonem tantummodo, sed cogitationem quoque humanam superant, ad similitudines & exempla confugiunt. — Sic ipsa Mystéria figurarum cuniculis operiuntur; ne vel hæc adeptis nuda rerum talium se Natura præbeat; sed Summatibus tantum Viris Sapientia Interprete veri Arcani consciis; contenti sint Reliqui ad venerationem figuris defendentibus a vilitate secretum,*
 1. *Macrob.* 2. *Ed. Lond.* 1694. Which he translates thus,
 "TO THE SAME PURPOSE *Macrobius* speaking of God
 "and Nature, says," *The Philosophers when they treated of*

such Subjects as were beyond all our Words, and exceeded even our Thoughts, they had Recourse to Similies and Allusions. FOR THAT THESE THINGS WERE AS MYSTERIES, WHICH THE WISE ONLY WERE CAPABLE OF RECEIVING; but that others should be content WITH AN AWFUL VENERATION for them under the Veil of Figures and Allegories, LEST THEY SHOULD BE DESPISED^k.

This comes of *Free-thinking*, and leaving his *School-books* to the *Clergy*: who owe him a Shame for that contemptuous Donation *.

I. We see here, he makes the Words, *Si quid de his assignare conantur, to confugiunt*, to relate to the *double Doctrine* of the Philosophers, as is evident by this Introduction, *To the same Purpose Macrobius*. To what Purpose, I beseech you? Why, to the Purpose of *Burnet's* Words immediately preceding, which expressly treat of the Nature of the *twofold Doctrine of the Ancients*. But who but a *Free-thinker* would not have found that these of *Macrobius* relate to a quite different thing? namely, the Inability of expressing spiritual and abstract Ideas any otherwise than by Words conveying sensible and material Images. Not, like the *external Doctrine*, a Matter of Choice, but *Necessity*; a Necessity arising from the Nature of Things. A Way of speaking the Philosophers could not avoid, even when conveying their *internal Doctrine* to their *Adepts*. But now the Reader will be apt to ask, If this be so, as is evident even from the Words themselves, what must we do with the rest of the Passage, beginning at *Sic ipsa Mysteria* ——— which does indeed relate to the *double Doctrine*; for it gives a Reason why Men have Recourse to *Similies and Allusions*, a Reason founded in the Nature and Expediency of the *double Doctrine*? What shall I say? that our Advocate has wilfully murdered and dismembered poor *Macrobius*? or, that it was mere Chance-medley? Let the Reader determine. It is sufficient he be made to know, that the latter Part of the Quotation, beginning at *Sic ipsa Mysteria*, has no other Relation to the former Part, beginning at *Si quid de his*

^k p. 20.

* See the Quot. at p. 6.

assignare, than is between two Things set in direct Opposition to one another.

2. *Macrobius* had observed, that the Philosophers did not admit the *fabulous* in *all* their Disputations; but in those only which related to the Soul, the HEAVENLY BODIES and the HERO-GODS. On the contrary when they discoursed of the *First Cause*, and the *Mind* proceeding from him, that then every thing was delivered agreeably to strict Truth—“*Sciendum est tamen non in omnem Disputationem Philosophos admittere fabulosa vel licita* *; *sed his uti solent, cum vel de anima, vel de AERIIS, ÆTHERIISVE POTESTATIBUS, vel de CETERIS DIS loquuntur. Ceterum cum ad summum & principem Omnium Deum, qui apud Græcos τὸ ἀρχαῖον qui μεγάλων αἰτίων nuncupatur, tractatus se audet attollere; vel ad Mentem, quam Græci νῦν appellant, Originales rerum species, quæ ιδεαὶ dictæ sunt, continentem, ex summo natam & profectam Deo: Cum de his, inquam, loquuntur, Summo Deo & Mente, nihil fabulosum penitus attingunt.*” But then he immediately subjoins, in the Words in Question, that, though here they spoke nothing but the *Truth*, yet, by Reason of the high Abstraction and spiritual Nature of the Subject, they were unavoidably at a loss for adequate Expressions, and therefore obliged to speak figuratively, that is, make use of sensible and material Images. SED SI QUID DE HIS ASSIGNARE CONANTUR, QUÆ NON SERMONEM TANTUMMODO, SED COGITATIONEM QUOQUE HUMANAM SUPERANT, AD SIMILITUDINES ET EXEMPLA CONFLUGIUNT.

When *Macrobius* had said this, and illustrated the last Observation by an Example from *Plato*, he goes on to

* All the old Editions had these Words *vel licita*: the more modern, not knowing what to make of them, fairly sunk them. *Gronovius* takes notice of the Fraud, and restores them to their Place, but in order finally to degrade them on a fair Hearing. He says they are corrupt, and should be read *vel ficta*. But *licita* is the genuine Word, which this Critic would have seen, had he apprehended that it signified those *theological Fables* allowed of by public Authority. So that *fabulosa vel licita* signify either such Fables as the Philosophers themselves invented, or such as they borrowed from the popular Belief.

the

the other Part of his Subject, namely to tell us how the Philosophers managed when they treated of the other Gods and the Soul ; then (he says) they admitted of the *fabulous* ; not childishly, or to please a wanton Imagination, but because they knew that exposing Nature naked as she was, would be greatly injurious to her. Who, as she withdraws herself from the Knowledge of the Vulgar by her various Covering and Disguise of FORMS, so 'tis her Pleasure that the Philosophers should handle her Secrets in Fable and Allegory. — “De Diis autem, ut dixi, ceteris, & de Anima non frustra se, nec ut oblectent, ad Fabulosa convertunt; sed quia sciunt Inimicam esse Naturæ apertam nudamque expositionem sui: quæ sicut vulgaribus Hominum sensibus intellectum sui vario rerum TEGMINE OPERIMENTOQUE subtrahit; ita a prudentibus Arcana sua voluit per Fabulosa tractari.” — Then follow the rest of the Words, which should be translated thus: *So the Mysteries themselves are hid under the Deceits of figurative Representations, lest the naked Truth should obtrude itself even on the Initiated. But while the Greatest Men, with Wisdom for their Guide, are conscious of the true Secret; the rest may be well content with such Representations as secure the Dignity of the Secret, and are contrived to excite their Veneration.* SIC IPSA MYSTERIA FIGURARUM CUNICULIS OPERIUNTUR, NE VEL HÆC ADEPTIS NUDA RERUM TALIU SE NATURA PRÆBEAT: SED SUMMATIBUS TANTUM VIRIS, SAPIENTIA INTERPRETE, VERI ARCANI CONSCIIS, CONTENTI SINT RELIQUI AD VENERATIONEM FIGURIS DEFENDENTIBUS A VILITATE SECRETUM. The Reader now sees that *this* Period, and the *other*, beginning with *Si quid de his assignare*, which our Advocate had tacked to it, are so far from belonging to one another, that the first describes the unavoidable Condition that attends the speaking *Truth*; the other the Advantages that may be reaped from *lying*. But as ill as he understood the Original, his own bad Translation, methinks, might have informed him, that the two Parts of the Quotation would have nothing to do with one another, they are so full of Contradiction. The first Part says, the high Subjects there spoken of *are beyond all our Words, and exceed even*

our Thoughts. The second Part says *no such Matter, the wise are capable of receiving them.* For the rest they must do as they can; *be content with, I don't know what, an awful Veneration, &c.* But more of this Matter presently.

3. For I have not yet done with this wondrous Advocate of old Philosophy. We have seen how he has acquitted himself as to the general Purport of the *Quotation*: Let us now see whether he be equally happy in the Sense he gives of the Words and Phrases.

The learned Reader perceives, that the Words last quoted, *Sic ipsa Mysteria, &c.* are an Illustration and Inforcement, taken from the Practice of the *Mysteries*, of the foregoing Observation, *that it was commendable to hide some things under Fables.* How does our Advocate translate *Sic ipsa Mysteria*? Thus, FOR THESE THINGS WERE AS MYSTERIES. So, from an *Illustration* he makes it an *Illation*: And *Mysteria*, the Rites so called, he degrades to a simple Secret. SIC FOR — IPSA THESE THINGS—MYSTERIA WERE AS MYSTERIES. A hopeful Scholar! He had Reason to upbraid us with the *Memory* of our *School-books*¹. Well, but what are *these things* that are so like *Mysteries*? Why, even by his own Account, *abstract Ideas expressed in metaphorical Terms.* According to this, the DICTIONARY should be the most *mysterious* Book in the World: And so, I suppose, our Freethinker found it: And having a natural Aversion to *Mysteries*, he turned himself to *Studies of quite another Nature*^m.

The next Words *Figurarum Cuniculis operiuntur*, he has passed over untranslated, and with good Reason. For as they allude to the *Shews of the Mysteries* represented in *subterraneous places*, he could have no kind of Conception of them. The next — *ne vel hæc Adeptis nuda rerum talium se Natura præbeat*, undergo the same Neglect; and on the same Account. He knew not what to make of *Adeptis*, the *Initiated*; and he thought too it contradicted

The next—*Sed Summatibus tantum Viris, Sapientia Interprete, veri Arcani consciis.* Here he breaks Silence, and, on my Word, to the Purpose, WHICH THE WISE ONLY

¹ See p. v. of his *Preface*. ^m p. viii. of the *Pref.*

WERE CAPABLE OF RECEIVING. *Sapientia Interprete, the Wise only are capable of receiving.* Notwithstanding the Difference of Number, it is plain he thought *Sapientia Interprete* was put in *Apposition* to *Summatibus Viris*. He did not see the Construction was *Summatibus Viris veri Arcani consciis, Sapientiâ Interprete*, nor that the *Sapientia Interpreter* alluded to the *Hierophant* of the *Mysteries*, who explained the Secret to the most capable of the *Initiated*, the *Summatibus Viris*; by which *Macrobius* meant Heroes, Princes, Legislators, in Allusion to their old Practice, of seeking Initiation into the greater Mysteries^a. And those he had distinguished from the rest of the *initiated*, by the foregoing Words, *ne vel hæc Adeptis nuda rerum talium se Natura præbeat*.

The concluding Words are, *Contenti sint Reliqui ad Venerationem Figuris defendentibus a Vilitate Secretum*, which he translates, *but that others should be content WITH AN AWFUL VENERATION FOR THEM, under the Veil of Figures and Allegories, LEST THEY SHOULD BE DESPISED.* What is meant by a *Worshipper's* being content with an *awful Veneration* I do not understand: Much less his being content with an *awful Veneration*, lest the things venerated should be despised. The Object worshipped indeed may be well enough said to be content with an *awful Veneration*, lest, if it should be unreasonable, and expect more, it might come to be despised. But, as our profound Translator well observes, *These Things are as Mysteries*, and so we'll leave them. However, the learned Reader sees he took *contenti sint Reliqui ad Venerationem Figuris*, to be the same as *contenti sint Reliqui veneratione Figurarum*, whereas it is equivalent to *contenti sint Reliqui Figuris ad Venerationem excogitatis*; and should be translated thus: *The rest may be well content with such Representations as secure the Dignity of the Secret, and are contrived to excite their Veneration.* What must we think of our Advocate? Does not he come well instructed in his Cause? Which shall we admire most; his Modesty, his Learning, or his Good Faith? But his *Translations*, of which his Book is almost all made up, abound with these

^a D. L. Vol. I. p. 192, 193, 194. Ed. 2^d.

Beauties ; I shall therefore reserve the Examination of them for a Work by it self, and leave him at present,

With all his blushing Honours thick upon him.

V.

Our Advocate goes on to the second of the Arguments, which, in his Apprehension, affects the present Question : namely, that the Philosophers held some fundamental Principles, which were altogether inconsistent with the Doctrine of future Rewards and Punishments. Of these he tells us, and, indeed, tells us fairly, that the first was, that God could neither be angry nor hurt any one. The second, that the Soul was a discerped Part of the Whole, and that this whole was God, into whom it was again to be resolved °.

These he undertakes to examine in their Order.

From the first, that God could not be angry nor hurt any one, I drew this Conclusion, that they could not believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments. Which I endeavoured to support from a Passage in Tully's Offices to this Effect. The Writer is commending Regulus for keeping his Oath. But (says he) it may be objected, what is there in an Oath? The Violator need not fear the Punishment of Heaven, for all the Philosophers hold that God cannot be angry nor hurt any one. To this Tully replies, and owns that indeed it was a Consequence of the general Opinion of God's not being angry, that the perjured Man had nothing to fear from the divine Vengeance. But then it was not this Fear, which was indeed nothing, but Justice and good Faith which made the real Sanction, or moral Obligation of an Oath. “ Quid est igitur, dixerit
“ quis, in Jurejurando? Num iratum timemus Jovem?
“ At hoc quidem commune est omnium Philosophorum,
“ numquam nec irasci Deum, nec nocere — Hæc quidem
“ Ratio non magis contra Regulum quam contra omne
“ Jusjurandum valet: sed in Jurejurando non qui Metus,
“ sed quæ Vis fit, debet intelligi. Est enim Jusjurandum
“ Affirmatio religiosa. Quod autem affirmate, quasi Deo
“ Teste, promiseris, id tenendum est: jam enim non ad
“ Iram Deorum, quæ nulla est; sed ad Justitiam & ad Fi-
“ dem pertinet P.”

° P. 47.

P De Offic. l. 3. c. 28, 29.

i. Now what says our Advocate to this? Upon the whole of this Authority (he says) *I think it appears that the OBJECTOR rightly cited an Opinion of the Philosophers, but, mistaking the true Meaning, drew a wrong Conclusion from it.* Tully, NOT TROUBLING HIMSELF TO CONFUTE OR SET HIM RIGHT, goes on with his Purpose, and proves the intrinsic Sacredness and Obligation of an Oath, without regarding the Circumstances of Hope or Fear^a. What an Idea has he here given us of this great Reasoner! Tully thinks an Objector worth taking notice of, and yet WILL NOT TROUBLE HIMSELF TO CONFUTE HIM. Without doubt our Advocate here compared Tully to himself for reasoning; as before he had compared himself to Chief Justice Hale for Greek. And because he can write books against an Objector^r without troubling himself to confute him, he thought Tully might do so too. But the best of the Story is, that this Objector proves to be Tully's own self: *Dixerit quis, a Man might perhaps object* (says he). And sure Tully did not mistake the true meaning of a common Opinion. And as for a voluntary Slip, it was not His Way, as it is this Author's, to make Blunders, and pass them off for other Men's, with a *dixerit aliquis*. But, it seems, Tully not only mistook the true Meaning, but drew a wrong Conclusion from it. This is hard. And, harder still, he had not the Patience to stay and set himself right. But sure, if he had all this Leisure to discredit his own Judgment, by inventing wrong Meanings, and drawing worse Conclusions, he would have found time to restore himself to his Reader's Opinion by confuting them. But then, whether the Objection was Tully's or another Man's, what a low Opinion must Tully have in the mean time, of the Importance of a Future State to Society, if, in a Book of Offices, he would not trouble himself to confute or set an Objector right, whom he had brought in with a mistaken Argument that overturned it? There is indeed a Time when a serious Writer would not trouble himself to confute or set a Wrangler right. And 'tis such an one as this, where the Perversity is so great, as to become an Insult upon every Reader's Understanding.

^a P. 49.

^r See his Title Page.

2. But his *Translation* is in all respects as curious as his *Comment*. It follows in these Words: *But some one might object and say, that Regulus need be under no Apprehension from the Breach of his Oath, of his being punished by the Gods, since it is a WELL KNOWN SAYING amongst Philosophers, That God cannot be angry.* “Tully, in answer to “this, says” *that this might be a Reason not only against Regulus, but against all Oaths whatsoever; for (says he) in swearing it is not the Fear of Punishment, but the EFFICACY and IMPORTANCE of it, which is to be regarded; for an Oath is a religious Affirmation made in the Presence of God, and as such ought to be solemnly observed. To conclude then, it is not the Anger of the Gods, which is NOTHING [IN THE PRESENT CASE] but Justice and Good Faith which is [IMMEDIATELY] to be RESPECTED^s.*

Hoc quidem COMMUNE est OMNIUM Philosophorum, says Tully. It is a WELL-KNOWN SAYING AMONGST the Philosophers, says his Translator, instead of, this is a Tenet common to all the Philosophers, commune Dogma, Decretum.

In Jurejurando (says Tully) non qui Metus, sed quæ Vis sit debet intelligi. In swearing (says his Translator) it is not the Fear of Punishment, but the EFFICACY and IMPORTANCE of it which is to be regarded. The pretended Objector observing that the People were chiefly influenced, in their Oaths, by the Fear of Divine Punishment, argues against the *Efficacy* of Oaths in this Manner. All the Philosophers (says he) hold that God cannot be angry, therefore he cannot punish; consequently Oaths will have no *Efficacy*, or there will be nothing in an Oath. To this Tully gives a plain Answer. The *Efficacy* of an Oath (says he) is not to be measured by the Degree of Fear that attends the taking it, but by the moral Obligation of keeping it, that is, by its proper *Sanction*. *In Jurejurando non qui Metus, sed quæ Vis sit debet intelligi. Literally, in swearing it ought to be considered not what Fear attends it, but what Sanction it hath.* And then shews, this Sanction to be good Faith. All here is close and well argued. Let us now hear how his Translator makes him reason. An Oath (says the Objector) is of no *EFFICACY* [*quid est in*

Jurejurando?] because *Fear* is no more. Oh, replies *Tully*, it is not *Fear*, but the EFFICACY and IMPORTANCE of an Oath that is to be regarded. Admirably concluded. And had *Tully* reasoned thus, I should have believed he had forgot his *Greek* too, and turned himself to *Studies of quite another Nature*.

But the Flower of Translations is the following. *Tully*; *Jam enim non ad Iram Deorum, QUÆ NULLA EST.* His Translator; *To conclude then, it is not the Anger of the Gods, which is NOTHING [IN THE PRESENT CASE] Quæ nulla est!* Here he believed in good earnest that *quæ nulla est* was equivalent to *quæ nihil ad rem pertinet*: and so it may be, for ought I know, in his *Law-Latin*, but in *Cicero's*, it signifies the same as *quæ vana & commentitia est*. *Tully*; *sed ad Justitiam & ad Fidem PERTINET.* His Translator; *but Justice and Good Faith which is [IMMEDIATELY] to be RESPECTED. Pertinet, immediately to be respected.* He could not find the Nominative Case to his Verb, and so took *pertinet* to be the impersonal. But another time let him remember it is governed of *ID.* *Jam enim [id quod promiseris] non ad Iram Deorum, quæ nulla est, sed ad Justitiam & ad Fidem pertinet.* Literally thus, *For now what you have promised relates not to the Anger of the Gods, which is indeed no Anger, but to Justice and Good Faith.* This concludes the Argument very logically. But our Advocate says, *Justice and good Faith is IMMEDIATELY to be respected*: Which vitiates the whole Reasoning. First, as these Words do not imply the Sanction, the very thing *Tully* is here fixing. Secondly, as they do imply that something else was to be respected, the very thing *Tully* is here opposing.

Is not this an able Interpreter of his old Philosophers? Yet the poor Man did his best; and, without doubt, laboured hard. With what Gravity does he introduce this Subject! *From the first [Principle] that God could not be angry nor hurt any one, he [Mr. W.] draws a Conclusion, that they could believe no future State, &c. which he endeavours to support by a Passage in Tully, the TRUE SENSE of which when CONSIDERED, will not, as I apprehend, answer his Purpose*^t.

^t p. 47, 48.

VI.

But he will still go on : To shew (says he) that the Ancients did not draw the same Conclusion from this Opinion of the Philosophers, as the Objector in Tully or Mr. Warburton, it appears in many places that they believed——What? that the GODS actually punished this very Crime, and that Men incurred their Anger and Displeasure by committing it^u. And so say I too. Nay more, I shew at large^w the Consistency of this Belief, that the Gods punished, with that other, that the one God did not. And yet to establish this important Point he brings two Witnesses, Cornelius Nepos and Xenophon.

But, as if conscious of the Impertinence, he talks more to the Purpose in what follows. And that Mr. Warburton's Distinction between the Anger of Demons and that of the Supreme Being may have no Place here, it may be necessary to shew by a Passage or two, that, as to the Effects, the same is asserted of the SUPREME GOD^x. This is saying something. But now to his Evidence. The first he produces are three Poets. Hesiod (says he) tells us, that he who speaks the Truth in public, will be rewarded by all-seeing Jove; but he who forswears himself, is irreparably lost, and his Posterity shall come to nothing, but the Generation of the Just shall flourish. And Phocylides, Forswear not thyself either inadvertently or knowingly, for the immortal God hateth a false Oath : and others have spoke to the same Purpose^y, for which he quotes 4 Iliad. 167.

1. Let us attend to the Question. It is, Whether the Greek Philosophers believed the One Supreme God punished and rewarded? And for the Proof of the Affirmative, he brings us three Greek Poets. But this is not the worst :

2. Two of these Poets do not so much as speak of the Supreme Being, but of the false Idol Gods of the People. Homer and Hesiod expressly call the God, they here speak of as the Rewarder and Punisher of true and false Swearers, ΖΕΥΣ ΚΡΟΝΙΑΗΣ, Jupiter Saturnius. Now it will be News, I suppose, to this Writer, that Jupiter Saturnius was not the One Supreme Being, but Jupiter the Son of Saturn, an Idol-Deity, though set at the Head of the College.

^u p. 50.^w D. L. Vol. I. p. 397—402.^x p. 52.^y p. 52, 53.

The other *Greek Poet* is, if possible, still less to his Purpose. For he happens to be no Heathen at all; indeed not so honest a Man: but a false Christian, the Disgrace of our holy Religion, who would put himself on the World for old *Phocylides* the *Milesian*, contemporary with *Theognis*. But the Imposture hath been detected by Critics of the first Order, such as *Joseph Scaliger*, *Ger.* and *Is. Vossius*, *D. Heinsius*, *Huetius*, *Reiskius*, *Barthius*, *Taubman*, &c. To the abundant Arguments they have produced, we may add this very Expression, cited by my Adversary, *ψευδοκλον ευρυέει θεός ἀβρολῶ*.

3. But had these *Poets* been *Philosophers*, and their *Idol Gods*, the *Supreme*, who, unless it was our Advocate, would not have seen that, in popular Writings, they must needs talk popularly, and keep an *esoteric* Opinion, so destructive of Society, to themselves?

But he comes yet closer to the Point.—And *PLATO* says, *GOD will execute Vengeance on him, who slighting the awful Majesty of his Divine Power, shall at any time forswear himself*². He hath given us a *Philosopher* at last we see; but to understand with what Judgment, we must again state the Question.

1. Which is, whether the Greek Philosophers BELIEVED that the Supreme God punished and rewarded. Now our Advocate hath *owned*, and, what is more, hath *proved* that the Philosophers had a two-fold Doctrine, an internal and an external; that the one contained Matter of *Belief*, the other of *Utility*. I have proved (to which our Advocate hath said nothing) that the Philosophers divided their Writings into two Classes, the *exoteric* and *esoteric*; and that this very Book of *Plato*, intituled, *Of Laws*, from whence he hath taken the Passage above, was of the *exoteric* kind. Yet for all this, he can without blushing, or, perhaps, without knowing why he should blush, quote the Book of *Laws*, for *Plato's* real Sentiments, in contradiction to what *Tully* and *Lactantius* tell us was Part of the *esoteric* Doctrine of *all* the Philosophers. The impartial Reader will hardly reflect on this without some Sort of Pity or Indignation. But what will he say when I tell him that this *Fallacy*, with others as gross, that have been

² P. 52, 53.

and shall be taken notice of in their Place, run through every Page of his Performance?

2. But we have not yet done with this Quotation from *Plato*. It is doomed to undergo a still greater Disgrace. In an evil Hour did our Advocate forget his *Greek*, unconscious that *Fate* and *Free-thinking* had decreed to raise him up, in Spite of Nature, for the Preparer of the Way to pure Pagan Philosophy, with his

—*Petite hinc, Juvenesque, Senesque,
Finem animo certum miserisque viatica canis*^a.

For here *Serranus* hath given him a terrible *quid pro quo*; which he hath innocently swallowed. This Translator makes *Plato* say *DEUS illum Odio prosequitur, qui SACRO-SANCTA DIVINI NUMINIS Authoritate neglecta falsum Juramentum dicit*^b. But *Plato* says no such thing. He speaks of the GODS, in the plural, such as the People worshipped. The whole Passage is in these Words: *Let no Man, when he invokes the GODS for his Truth, mix any thing of Falshood, Fraud, or Insincerity, either in his Word or Deed; unless he chuses to become most hateful to the Gods. As in the first Place is he, who, without any Reverence to the GODS, swears falsely: And in the second Place, he, who lies before his Betters.* Ψεῦδος μὴδεὶς μὴδὲν, μὴδ' ἀπάτῃ, μὴδέ τι κίβδηλον, ἤτοι ἐπικαλέσμενος ΘΕΩΝ, μήτε λόγῳ μήτε ἔργῳ πρᾶξαιεν, ὃ μὴ θεομισέσασθαι [Diis infensissimus, says *Serranus* rightly here] ἔσεσθαι μέλλων· ἔτι δ' εἰσὶν ὁ αὖθις ὁμνῶν ψευδὲς μὴδὲν φρονιζῆν ΘΕΩΝ· δούτερος γ', ὃς ἀν' ἐνώπιον τῶν Κρείττονων αὐτῶ ψεύδεται. Had our Advocate had the least Taste of Antiquity, he might have seen, from the concluding Period, with what Spirit the whole was written. With no other sure than to instruct the People in their Devoirs to Society. A likely Place to find any of *Plato's* esoteric Doctrines.

But if one considers the whole Evidence together, one would wonder how it could ever enter seriously into the Head of one, whose Profession (if it taught him any thing) taught him to judge of the Nature of Evidence, that Poets, writing to the People, and speaking their Language, or a Poetical Philosopher writing a Popular book of Laws to keep

^a The Motto to his Title Page.

^b Plat. 917, a. Ed. Serr.

them in Order, should ever talk to a Heathen Commonalty of the *only One God*.

VII.

But he is wiser in what follows. *The next Authority* (says he) *Mr. Warburton brings to strengthen his Conclusion is from Lactantius, which he calls an illustrious Instance; but on reading, it turns out so low and insipid, THAT IT IS NOT WORTH CONSIDERING* ^c. Indeed, so short! How happy had it been for him had he passed the same Judgment on all the rest! The Argument from *Lactantius* stood thus: That eloquent Writer, in defending *Christianity*, found nothing so much opposed the Doctrine of a *future Judgment*, as a prevailing Principle common to all the Philosophers, that God could not be angry. He therefore composed his Discourse intituled *De Ira Dei*, to combat this following Syllogism:

If God hath no Affections of Love or Hatred, Fondness or Anger, he cannot reward or punish.

But he hath no Affections, &c.

Therefore, &c.

A modern Advocate of Religion would certainly have denied the *major*, but that was a Principle which *Lactantius* expressly tells us was received by all Parties. He therefore turns his whole Discourse against the *minor*; and endeavours to prove that God hath these Affections. Nor does he at all mince the Matter. For he tells us there are in God, as in Man, the Passions of Love and Hatred: And, to make all sure, contends for God's having an human Form. Now the Inference I drew from it was this, that, as *Lactantius* was admirably well skilled in all Pagan Philosophy, he could not mistake a Principle which all the Philosophers held, nor a Consequence which they all drew from it. The *Principle* was, that the Supreme God had no Affections; and the *Consequence*, that he could neither reward nor punish. Therefore this *Principle* and this *Consequence* were held by ALL, the Point to be proved. It was on this Account, that I called the Case of *Lactantius* an *illustrious one*. Our Advocate says 'tis *low and insipid, and not worth considering*. Utri creditis, Quirites?

But I commended him too soon. He won't let the Matter rest when 'tis well: See then what comes of it.

He tells the Reader, that *I myself say* Lactantius *knew little of Christianity*^d. Egregious Advocate! must not this be the very Cause (if there were any Cause at all) of those *Philosophic Prejudices*, which so fatally disposed him to attack the *minor* rather than the *major*? — *That he fell into many Errors*^e. Could it be otherwise while he opposed the *minor*? — *That his Treatise was obscure*^f. Must it not needs be so, when his Opposition to the *minor* led him to maintain, that there is in God, as in Man, the Passions of Love and Hatred? — *And strongly contended that God had a human Form*^g. Was not this Extravagance a full Proof that the Connexion between the *Principle* (of God's having no Passions) and the *Consequence* (that he could neither punish nor reward) was so universally held that he could find no Way to *break through*; but was forced to *evade* it, by asserting God had Passions? For which to provide a proper Subject, he thought fit to give him a human Form likewise. — *All then* (says our Advocate) *that appears from this illustrious Instance is, that Lactantius grossly mistook this fine Sentiment of the Philosophers*^h. Does he know whom he talks of? Why, this *Lactantius* was a *Philosopher* himself; not like that canting Tribe of Dunces, *Porphyry*, *Jamblicus*, &c. who first brought their Fanaticism into the Schools of Philosophy, which so soon after, and so fatally infected the Church of *Christ*; but one whom the greatest Monarch of the World made choice of for the Governor of his Son. He was a *Lawyer* too, and his Critics say, a happy Emulator of the Eloquence of *Cicero*. Yet our Advocate believes in good earnest, that *he grossly mistook this fine Sentiment of the Philosophers*. Alas! what he *mistook* were the *fine Sentiments of Christianity*; and this in too warm a Zeal for overturning those of *Philosophy*, which he understood but too well. — *And in combating with it fell into a Puddle of foul Absurdities*ⁱ. Who told him so? Doctors differ. *St. Jerom* calls this Tract *De Ira Dei, pulcherrimum Opus*. Which had our Advocate known, with-

^d p. 53.^e *Ibid.*^f *Ibid.*^g *Ibid.*^h p. 54.ⁱ p. 54.

out doubt, he had opposed the Judgment of a Father of the Church to mine. For, to say the Truth, I am answerable for all the Freedoms he here takes with *Laëtantius*; what he knew of the *De Ira Dei* being only from the *Divine Legation*. But I produce the Authority of *Jerom*, who differs so much from my Sentiments of the Tract, to shew the Reader that *Laëtantius's* Manner of supporting a *future Judgment* against the Philosophers, was the approved Defence of the learned Christians of that time. Consequently *Laëtantius* did not *grossly mistake this FINE Sentiment of the Philosophers*.

VIII.

But this *Principle* seems fated to disgrace him; so that he can't for his Life let it alone. He goes on therefore in these Words. *To clear this Matter more fully, it may now be proper to consider the PRINCIPLE itself, which, as Mr. Warburton says, greatly embarrassed Antiquity; because the Ancients, says he, could not distinguish between human Passions and the divine Attributes of Justice and Goodness, p. 393. But I hope to make it appear, that the Ancients were not at all embarrassed; and that they distinguished in this Particular, just in the same Manner as we do now^k.*

He tells the Reader, I say *the PRINCIPLE greatly embarrassed Antiquity*, and refers to page 393. Let the Reader then hear me speak. “We see *Tully* owns the *Consequence* of this universal *Principle*.——A modern Reader, full of the Philosophic Ideas of these late Ages, will be surprised, perhaps, to be told, THAT THIS CONSEQUENCE GREATLY EMBARRASSED ANTIQUITY; when he can so easily evade it, by distinguishing between human Passions and the divine Attributes of Justice and Goodness, on which alone the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments is invincibly established. But the Ancients had no such precise Ideas of the Divine Nature. They knew not how to sever Anger from its Justice, nor Fondness from its Goodness.”——He charges me with saying *the PRINCIPLE greatly embarrassed Antiquity*: and I say *the CONSEQUENCE* from that Principle *greatly embarrassed*

^k *Ibid.*

Antiquity. What are we to think of this? that it was done with Design? Alas! no. The poor Man knew no Difference between *Principles* and *Consequences*, *Premisses* and *Conclusions*. Or if he had any Meaning, it was to shew his Contempt of these, and all other my *nice Distinctions, Divisions, and Subdivisions, which, he tells us, he passes over as needless Curiosities*¹.

But his next attendant Effort is still more surprising. For he rises in his Blunders, like *Homer's Battles* in their Terror. I had said *the Ancients were embarrassed*. He will prove *they were not at all embarrassed*, without so much as knowing what *Ancients* must needs be meant. Now the intelligent Reader sees they are the ancient CHRISTIAN, not *Pagan Writers*, for this plain Reason, That, tho' I hold neither Christian nor Pagan Writers could *distinguish between human Passions and the divine Attributes*, yet none but *Christian Writers* could be *embarrassed* with the *Consequence* of God's not being angry (which Consequence was, that therefore he could not punish) because none but *Christians* (according to my Assertion) held that he could punish. Now from their holding, as they did at first, with the *Philosophers*, that God *could not be angry*, and with the *Founders of their Faith*, that he *would punish*, arose all that EMBARASS I took notice of; and which of course I must suppose the Pagans free from, by their not holding those two supposed contrary Propositions. Our Advocate, who had not the least Conception of all this, will yet venture to contradict me; and taking it for granted, as he does every thing he can't prove, that I meant PAGAN Antiquity lay under this *Embarrass*, he brings a Number of Passages from Pagan *Philosophers* to confute my Assertion. Thus all he proves, if he should chance to prove any thing, being nothing to the Purpose, I might here fairly leave him to himself.

But as *Pagan Antiquity*, tho' it was not *embarrassed* like the *Christian*, yet was not at all more *exact* in its Ideas of the Divine Attributes, I will permit our Advocate, for once, to suppose, that I had said, that *the ancient Philosophers were embarrassed, and could not distinguish between hu-*

¹ p. 3.

man Passions, and the Divine Attributes: Let us see then what he will make of it. But as I restore him his Arms, and instruct him how to use them, it may be allowed me to remind my Reader,

1. That when I say they could not distinguish between *human Passions and the Divine Attributes*, I mean the Attributes of the *first Cause of all Things*.

2. When I say they could not *distinguish*, I mean distinguish in such a Manner, as to leave Room for the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments; all other *Distinctions* being out of the Question.

Well then, to prove that Antiquity was not embarrassed, how does this mighty Champion of Old Philosophy set out? Why first he proves *that he himself is not embarrassed*^m. Secondly, that *those who read the Scripture cannot be embarrassed*ⁿ. But this is only to feel his own Strength, and make the Flourish of his Arms. He soon comes to himself, and then says, *But that the Reader may see how rightly the Philosophers could distinguish between human Passions and the Divine Attributes, I shall now lay before him some Passages, in which it is said God is not subject to Passion, or that he is void of Anger, and can hurt none; and others, where he is said to be angry, and to punish Sinners for their Crimes; by which every one may the better judge, whether the Ancients were not exactly of the same Opinion as himself, and did not speak as Christians now do, sometimes with regard to the ineffable and absolute Rectitude of an infinitely perfect Being, and sometimes with Respect to the Relation he bears to us his finite and imperfect Creatures*^o. This is indeed to the Point.

And first, says he, *I readily agree with Mr. Warburton, that it was the Opinion of all the Philosophers, that God could not be angry, nor hurt any one*^p. And though we agree in this, yet he will bring several Witnesses to prove it. This is always his Way when he has so safe Ground to go upon. Thus he proved the *double Doctrine* of the Philosophers, and the *single Object* of that double Doctrine. And on such Occasions, I must acquaint the Reader, he is a most unmerciful Prover. But as he can

^m See p. 54.

ⁿ p. 55.

^o p. 55, 56.

^p p. 56.

never forbear mixing and confounding the several Parts of his Subject, the last of his Testimonies, to prove *God cannot be angry*, being taken from *Seneca*, he is drawn to another Question before his Time. But Order, Method, and Logic, we know, are nothing with this Writer. However, a good Thing never comes amiss. What then says *Seneca*? That that Man is mistaken, who supposes the Gods can hurt any one; for they neither can do wrong, nor suffer it, both of which betoken Frailty. But *Seneca* immediately after says, that the GODS do exact Punishment, and chastise some for their Good. Therefore *Seneca* must either contradict himself, or speak of the same Beings in different Respects; and indeed these two last Passages of *Seneca*, one of which is quoted by Mr. Warburton, TO PROVE that the Gods can hurt none, seem to have no Reference to their just Anger against Sinners, but to such Hurt or Injury as arises from Wrong or Injustice^q.

1. This whole Remark is nothing to the Purpose. *Seneca* here means the GODS of Paganism, not the first Cause of all Things, where he talks of their punishing and chastising. Now the first Cause is the Subject of our Question.

2. But of these two Passages, one is quoted by me (he says) TO PROVE that the Gods can hurt none. The Passage is in page 402, of the second Edition. My Words are these, *A Benevolence too that went not from the Will, but the Essence of the Supreme Being*: SO *Seneca* informs us, *Quæ causa est Diis, &c.* Here again his old Luck follows him. I quoted it to shew what Kind of Benevolence they gave to God: He says, I quoted it to prove the Gods can hurt none.

Having thus notably supported his Agreement with me, that it was the Opinion of the Philosophers that God could not be angry nor hurt any one; he proceeds, *But that THEY are angry, so as to punish the wicked for their Crimes, might be proved by a multitude of Testimonies*^r. Without doubt it might. But what then? I require him to shew, that the Philosophers believed the One God could be angry and punish; and he says, they believed their false Gods

^q p. 58.

^r p. 58, 59.

could.

could. And so said I, and proved it likewise. Yet he brings Witness upon Witness, Poets upon Philosophers, to shew they thought THE GODS *could be angry and punish*: And then goes on thus: *By all which it manifestly appears, that when the Ancients said, GOD could not be angry, they meant, &c.* Was there ever such a Reasoner? He will prove what the Ancients thought of their *false* GODS, a Thing nobody asked; and from thence conclude, what they thought of the SUPREME, a Thing nobody will believe.

But lest the Reader should suspect, as he has little Reason, that this was only a Blunder in Words; and that though our Advocate promised to shew by Quotations, what was nothing to the Purpose, yet the Quotations themselves might haply inform us of what was; I shall run through his Passages.

The two first^t are from *Plato's Book of Laws*, a Writing of the *exoteric* Kind, in which the Philosopher speaks to the People; and consequently must needs speak of those Gods they were acquainted with. In one of the Passages he actually uses the *plural*, in the other the *singular*, used perpetually, in the Writings of the Ancients, for the *plural*: Sometimes as the peculiar tutelary God of the People was meant; sometimes as it was *Jupiter* the first of the Class; but most frequently as it was a common Figure of Speech for a *Greek* Republican to say the *God* or the *Magistrate*, when there were a hundred of each. But what will surprise our Advocate (who appears not to have received Instruction on this Matter) they sometimes, though very rarely, used the *Plural* for the *Singular*. As *Seneca*, in the Place that came in Question just above, *Quæ causa est Diis*, &c. and *Sallust*, in another, that will come in Question below. A little Discernment is sufficient to take them right, in either of these *conversions*. But this is more, it seems, than we are to expect of our Advocate, who puzzling on, between his *true* and *false* Gods, hangs, like a false Teacher as he is, between Heaven and Earth, in the Fool's Paradise of Pagan Philosophy.

^t p. 60.

^t p. 59.

The other two Passages he brings ^u are from a spurious Thing given to *Cicero*. This was a pleasant Mistake. He had seen me quote *Tully de Consolatione*, twice, and therefore thought he might safely do the same. But my two Passages were from the genuine Fragments of that lost Book; his two, by the Malice of his old Luck, from that Forgery of *Sigonius*, intituled, *De Consolatione*, and fathered upon *Tully*: But it could never get a Godfather till our Advocate became its *Sponsor*. *Cicero* (says he) *says that a Man by his Wickedness becomes an Enemy and hated of God*. And for this decisive Saying *Cic. de Consol.* is quoted.

He goes on, *But we need not question the Philosophers, when the Poets say the same* ^x. Nay, it must be owned they're all in a Story. And how should they chuse, when prompted by their *false Gods*, in whose Favour they are speaking?

At length however, as if even sensible of the Impertinence of all he had been saying, he goes on thus: *But not to let this Matter rest wholly upon CONCLUSIONS, though never so well grounded.*——He means *Inferences*. You must excuse him. If he be there, or thereabouts, 'tis enough for a Man so averse to the *Nicety of Distinction*. Well, *not to let it rest then* (though I suspect it had been the wiser Course, as I am so well acquainted with his Way of mending Matters) What then? Why, he will further shew what *Constructions* they put upon such Expressions, by one who has wrote a whole Chapter upon this Question, “*In what Sense can the Gods, who are immutable, be said to be either angry or appeased?*” In which he tells us, that “*God cannot, properly speaking, be said to rejoice, for then he must sometimes be affected with Sorrow; nor to be angry, since Anger is a Motion of the Mind; nor to be pleased with Gifts, for that would be to be overcome with Pleasures, &c; but while we are good, we are united to the Gods by Similitude, and when wicked, separated for our Unlikeness: Not that they are really angry, but that our Offences hinder the Light of their Goodness from shining upon us; wherefore it is the same thing to say, God*

^u p. 59.

^x p. 60.

“ *hateth,*

“ *hateth or is angry with Sinners, as to say the Sun is hid from the Eyes of those who are blind*”^y. These are the Words of *Sallust* the Philosopher. To which I answer,

1. That this *Sallust* is no legal Evidence. I have expressly excepted against him and all his Fellows, all that came so long after the Times in question; which I confine to the Period before *Christ*. The rising of the *Gospel*, I confess, again and again, gave such Light to the *Philosophers*, that they refined all their Doctrines by its Splendor, and then, like their mimic Brethren of the present Age, ungratefully abused their Benefactors. These are my Words in one Place of my Book: “ Such was
“ the general Doctrine on this Point before the coming
“ of Christianity. But then those Philosophers who held
“ out against its Truth, after some Time, new-modelled
“ both their Philosophy and Religion: making their
“ Philosophy more religious, and their Religion more
“ philosophical.—So amongst the many Improvements of
“ Paganism, the softening this Doctrine was one.— And
“ it is remarkable, that *then, and not till then the Philo-*
“ *sophers began really to believe the Doctrine of a future State*
“ *of Rewards and Punishments*”^z. What now must we think of our Advocate? Was there ever any thing so shameless? Yet this is one of his hackney Fallacies that runs on all his Errands.

2. But as our Advocate is turned Solicitor, and, without doubt, has been at much pains in finding out this Witness, we will hear him. And if he should chance to prove what I affirm, and what my Adversary denies, it would be but the common Case of Evidence picked up at a Venture, to support a bad Cause. To keep him no longer in Suspense, I must here let him know, that, had I searched all Antiquity, I could not have found a Passage more to my Purpose. Such is his old Luck at quoting.

This *Sallust* having put together some common-place Stuff of the *Gods and the World*, in his fourteenth Chapter proposes to speak to this Question, *How the immutable Gods may be said to be angry and appeased*. Πῶς οἱ Θεοὶ μὴ μεταβάλλομενοι, ὀργίζεσθαι καὶ θεραπεύεσθαι λέγονται.

^y p. 62, 63.

^z D. L. p. 416, 417. 2^d Ed.

He says, in the first place, that God has no human Passions, he *neither rejoices, is angry, nor appeased with Gifts*, ἡ χαίρει Θεός — ἡ δὲ ὀργίζεται — ἡ δὲ δώρις δευραπύεται. So far doubtless is agreeable to Truth. But how then? Why that the Gods are *eternally beneficent*, or as *Seneca* had said, *Causa Diis benefaciendi NATURA*, and *beneficent only, but never hurtful*, ἐκείνοι μὲν ἀγαθοὶ τε εἰσιν ΑΕΙ, καὶ ὠφελῶσι μόνον βλάβησι δὲ ἰδέσθαι. Thus having avoided one Extreme, he falls into another, and supposeth it *blind Nature* and not *Will* that determines God's Beneficence. The Inference from this is, that the Rewards and Punishments of Heaven are the *natural and necessary Effects* of Actions; not *positive, arbitrary Consequences*, or the Designation of Will. And so our Philosopher maintains. For now the Difficulty being, that if *Nature be the Cause of the Beneficence of the Godhead*, how can Providence bestow Good on the virtuous Man, and Evil on the Wicked? Our Sophist resolves it thus: *While we are good we are joined by Similitude of Nature to the Gods, and when Evil separated by Dissimilitude—They become our Enemies, not because they are angry at us, but because our Crimes hinder the Gods from shining on us — wherefore it would be the same thing to say, that God is turned away from the Evil, as to say, the SUN IS HID FROM A BLIND MAN.* Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἀγαθοὶ μὲν ὄντες δι' ὁμοιότητα Θεοῖς κοινωνούμεθα, κακοὶ δὲ ἁνόμοτοι δι' ἀνομοιότητα χωρίζομεθα — ὅτι ἐκείνων ὀργισμῶν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀμαρτημάτων Θεῶν μὲν ἡμῖν ὅτι ἐόντων ἐκλάμπειν — ὥστε ὅμοιον τὸ Θεὸν λέγειν τὴν κακὴν δόξασθαι καὶ τὸ ἅλιον τοῖς ἐστρημένοις τὸ ὄψων κρύπτεσθαι. An apt Comparison, and very expressive of the Case; where the Influence of the Deity is supposed to be *natural*, like the Sun's, and consequently all Reward and Punishment, not the *moral*, but the *necessary Issue* of Things. A Platonic Principle^a entirely subversive of the proper Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, as believed every where by the People, and taught by the Christian Religion. But this Matter I had explained at large in page 398 of the Book he pretends to write against. The Pagans then, we find, in taking away human Passions from God, left him nothing but an essential Excellence, that went not from his *Will*, but his *Nature* only, and

^a See the D. L. Vol. I. p. 320. Ed. 2.

consequently was destitute of *Morality*. This was one Extreme. The *Primitive Christians*, as *Lactantius*, seeing clearly that the Platonic Notion of God overturned a *future Judgment*, and not seeing that Medium which their Masters in Science, the *Philosophers*, had missed of, maintained that God had human Passions. And this was the other Extreme. And whence, I pray, did both arise, but from neither's being able to distinguish *between human Passions* and THE DIVINE ATTRIBUTES OF JUSTICE AND GOODNESS, the true Medium between *human Passions* and a *blind Excellence of Nature*? Did not I guess right when I said, if he would not let the Matter rest, he would soon make it worse? Yet hear how triumphantly he goes off; unconscious of all the fine Work he has been making. *And now I may venture to affirm* (says he) *that no one can reasonably imagine this Opinion of the Philosophers, that God cannot be angry, &c. could be any the least Obstacle to their believing a future State of Rewards and Punishments*^b. I, for my Part, will only venture to affirm that the Dispute between us (if that may be called a *Dispute* where there is no *Contradiction*) stands thus: I had said, *The Ancients could not distinguish between human Passions and the divine Attributes of Justice and Goodness in the FIRST CAUSE of all Things*: And he has proved they could distinguish between just and unjust Passions in their IDOLATROUS GODS. I had said they could not so distinguish as to leave any Foundation for the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punishments: And he has proved that I said true, by one of his own Witnesses, *Sallust* the Philosopher. But, what the Reader can reasonably imagine, upon this View of the Evidence, as I would not pretend to direct his Judgment, *I will not venture to affirm*.

IX.

I now come to the next Principle (says our Advocate) *which Mr. Warburton lays down as repugnant to the Belief of a future State, &c. which is, "That the generality of the Philosophers held the Soul to be a discerped Part of a whole, and this whole was God, into whom it was again*

^b p. 63.

“ to be resolved.” BUT HERE HE BEGINS, AS IN OTHER
 “ PLACES, TO EXPRESS HIS FEARS *that the Reader*
 “ will suspect (as I am apt to think he will) *these Kind of*
 “ Phrases are “ highly figurative Expressions, and not to
 “ be measured by the severe Standard of metaphysical Pro-
 “ priety;” and therefore he desires the Reader to take no-
 tice of another Consequence from this Principle, which is,
 that the Soul was eternal *à parte antè*, as well as *à parte*
post; and this, as he says, was universally held by Anti-
 quity, tho’ he attempts to bring but one Authority to prove
 it, which he says is above Exception; and therefore I shall
 transcribe it out of his own Book, as he quotes it from Cud-
 worth, that the Reader may the better judge of its Validi-
 ty. “ It is a thing very well known (says the great Cud-
 “ worth) that according to the Sense of Philosophers these
 “ two things were always included together, in that one
 “ Opinion of the Soul’s Immortality, namely its *Præ-exist-*
 “ *ence* as well as its *Post-existence*; neither was there ever
 “ any of the Ancients before Christianity, that held the Soul’s
 “ future Permanency after Death, who did not likewise as-
 “ sert its *Præ-existence*; they clearly perceiving, that if it
 “ was once granted that the Soul was generated, it could
 “ never be proved but that it might also be corrupted: And
 “ therefore the Assertors of the Soul’s Immortality commonly
 “ began here; first to prove its *Præ-existence*, &c. &c.”

Here (says he) he begins, as in other Places, to express
 his FEARS. This is the second Time he has told me
 of my Fears. And without Doubt he took me in good
 earnest for some very fearful Animal, or he would never
 have ventured so wantonly to insult me. But the Reader
 perhaps may be curious to know how that Writer ex-
 presses his Fears of his own Arguments, who has been
 represented by the Bigots of the opposite Party, as de-
 spising all other Men’s. The fearful Passage is in these
 Words: “ And that the Reader may not suspect these
 “ kind of Phrases, as that the Soul is *Part of God*; *dis-*
 “ *cerpted from him*; of his Nature; which perpetually
 “ occur in the Writings of the Ancients, to be only *high-*
 “ *ly figurative Expressions*, and not to be measured by

“ the exact Standard of metaphysical Propriety ; he is de-
 “ fired to take notice of one Consequence drawn from
 “ this Principle, and universally held by Antiquity, which
 “ was this, that the Soul was eternal *à parte ante*, as well
 “ as *à parte post* ; which the Latins well expressed by the
 “ Word *Sempiternus* ^d.” Does the Reader find any of that
 Passion here which our quick-sighted Advocate has dis-
 covered ? All I can say to the Matter is, that as it is the
 Punishment of *free-acting* to *fear* for ones self, *where no*
Fear is ; so it is, it seems, the Reward of *free-thinking* to
see Fear for others where no Fear is.

Well, but let us hear what he has to say to the Passage
 from Cudworth. Now I readily agree (says he) that what
 Cudworth says of the Philosophers is true, but deny that what
 Mr. Warburton quotes him for, can any ways be proved
 from thence ; which is, that the Philosophers held the Soul
 to be eternal *à parte antè* as well as *à parte post* ; and in-
 deed there is not ONE WORD which either expresses, or,
 WITH ANY TOLERABLE PROPRIETY, implies any such
 Doctrine. They held, says Cudworth, the Soul's *Præ-exist-*
ence, or that it was in Being before the Body ; but it will
 IMMEDIATELY OCCUR to the Reader, that if it *præ-ex-*
isted only one Day or one Hour, before it was infused into
 the Body, it really *præ-existed* as much, though not so long,
 as if it had been from Eternity. And the whole Design of
 Cudworth is to shew, that the Ancients held the Soul to be
 immortal. FOR this Reason amongst others that it was not
 propagated with the Body, and therefore could not be cor-
 rupted with it ; but was a distinct Substance from it, for
 that it *præ-existed*, or was made before it, as he proves from
 a Passage of Aristotle. Therefore the Doctrine of *Præ-ex-*
istence does not in the least prove the Soul to be eternal *à*
parte antè ; much less that it was *discerped* or *torn* from
 God in a literal Sense ^e. Pity me, Reader ! who am for-
 ced into a Controversy with an Advocate of old Philoso-
 phy, who has not yet so much as learnt his first Elements
 either in the *old* or *new*. Why, thou mighty Man of
 Law ! if the Ancients were to prove (as in this Case you
 own they were) that the Soul was eternal *à parte post* by

^d D. L. Vol. I. p. 405. Ed. 2.

^e p. 65, 66.

an Argument taken from its *Præ-existence*, and that it was an acknowledged Principle (as we both agree it was) *that whatsoever was generated could not be proved to be incorruptible*, must not by that *Præ-existence* be meant an *eternal* *Præ-existence*? For if there were a Time when the Soul was *generated*, though many millions of Years before its Entrance into the Body, it could not be proved to be *eternal à parte post*. The acknowledged Principle *that whatever was generated could not be proved to be incorruptible*, forbidding that Conclusion. For the Reader must take notice, their Point was not to give an *analogical Probability* that the Soul *simply* survived the Body, but a *metaphysical Demonstration* that it would survive *for ever*. And let him not imagine that our Advocate has only mistaken the Question, and argued right from the wrong State of it. He delivers it truly in these Words, *The whole Design of Cudworth is to shew, that the Ancients held the Soul to be IMMORTAL*. He wanted, we see, no Knowledge of the particular Question; all his Want was Want of common Apprehension. Yet *Cudworth* thought the Argument so obvious, that no one who was fit to read his Book, could possibly mistake in it: and therefore contented himself in using *Præ-existence* simply, without adding *eternal*, as the Argument necessarily determined the *Mode* of the *Præ-existence*. Yet has he at length got a Reader who is fairly able to mistake him, and who, instead of being thankful for an Explanation made, as it appears, for his peculiar Use, will find fault with his Instructor, and not content with saying that *there is not one Word in Cudworth, which expresses my Sense*, will add, *that there is nothing that can with any tolerable Propriety imply it*. This he says; and yet (what exceeds Belief) he had but just before transcribed these very Words of *Cudworth*: THEY CLEARLY PERCEIVING, THAT, IF IT WAS ONCE GRANTED THAT THE SOUL WAS GENERATED, IT COULD NEVER BE PROVED, BUT THAT IT MIGHT ALSO BE CORRUPTED. Now if he would not see it, is he fit to write? And if he could not, is he fit to be read? Who can be positive, after this, that he ever saw *Cudworth's* Book, which concludes the whole Observation in these Words. “The *Totum* or *Compositum* of a Man or
“ Animal

“ Animal may be said to be *generated* and *corrupted* in re-
 “ gard of the Union and Disunion, Conjunction and
 “ Separation of those two Parts, the Soul and Body. But
 “ the Soul it self, according to these Principles, is NEI-
 “ THER A THING GENERABLE NOR CORRUPTIBLE^f.”

Yet our Advocate tells us, *the whole Design of Cudworth is to shew, that the Ancients held the Soul to be immortal FOR this Reason amongst others, that it was not propagated with the Body, and therefore could not be corrupted with it.* Which is just as wise a Reason as the following: *The last Lord Mayor of London will live a thousand Years, FOR this Reason, amongst others, that he was in being before his Entrance on his Office, and existed after his going out of it.* But he has all the Way done Wonders with his FOR. I have taken upon me to dignify several of them with *Capitals* for their eminent Services. But the bold Humour of the *English* is never to spare this Particle. On the contrary, the *French*, a wise People, when the Royal Academy was founded for the Advancement of *Eloquence*, with which Reason had little to do, held a solemn Sessions for the Extirpation of their FOR, CAR, as an useless and dangerous Word. And though I think it escaped, and even survived the Edict of *Nants* (notwithstanding all the Mischief it had done the Catholic Cause) yet their prudent Writers are extremely reserved in the Use of this and all other their *illative Particles*. Feu Gomberville (says one of their Dictionary Writers) *haïssoit le mot CAR, parce, disoit il, qu'il venoit du Grec.* The late Gomberville hated the word CAR, because, as he said, it came from the Greek. How happy for us, that our FOR is differently descended, or we had lost a great Reasoner, who bears as thorough an Antipathy to Greek, as ever did Monsieur Gomberville!

He goes on, *And if I may be allowed to argue in the same Way as Mr. Warburton.* The Public, I believe, will pardon him, let him begin when he will. Well, but allow him to do what, however, we are never to expect of him, to talk a little plain Sense, what then? Why *the Ancients could not strictly believe this Doctrine* [that the Soul was Part of God] *because it is greatly INCON-*

^f *Intell. Syst.* p. 39.

SISTENT with another well known Opinion amongst them, that Souls were linked to Bodies for a Punishment, or sent down as into a State of Tryal. Now for his Reason.—FOR to suppose in the gross Sense, that Pieces or Parts of the ever perfect and supreme God were so served, IS WHAT NO ONE WILL IMAGINE THE PHILOSOPHERS CAPABLE OF^s. FOR is here again, as usual, on very desperate Service. He promises to shew the *Inconsistency* between two *metaphysical* Opinions. What Reader now but would expect a *metaphysical* Reason? Instead of that he puts us off with a *moral* one. No one will imagine the *Philosophers* capable of holding both those Opinions. And to finish the Absurdity, this is called arguing like me, in an Instance where I proved the Meaning of a *metaphysical* Term by a *metaphysical* Opinion. If I may be allowed, says he, to argue in the same Way as Mr. Warburton.

2. But to be at a Word with him and his Philosophers together. What both are CAPABLE OF we shall now see. It is agreed that *Pythagoras* and *Plato* held that Souls were linked to Bodies for a Punishment, or sent down as into a State of Trial. Yet of this very *PYTHAGORAS* *Cicero* speaks thus: *Nam Pythagoras, qui censuit Animum esse per naturam rerum omnem intentum & commeantem ex qua nostri animi CARPERENTUR, non vidit Distractione humanorum Animorum DISCERPI ET LACERARI DEUM.* OF *PLATO* and his Followers *Arnobius* speaks thus: *Ipse denique Animus qui IMMORTALIS a vobis & DEUS ESSE NARRATUR, cur in Ægris æger sit, in Infantibus stolidus, in Senectute defessus? Delira & fatua & insana!* Here we see what two great Writers of Antiquity thought the Philosophers capable of. Was he ignorant of this? No; I had quoted them in the Discourse he pretends to confute^b. Did he attempt to confute them? No; nor a great Number more to the same Purpose, unless this may be called a Confutation, And we may observe, that SOME of his Authorities to prove this are exceedingly strained, and, as himself acknowledges more than once, are otherwise understood by learned Men. SOME? What then are the rest? But as to these some, does he prove what he says? Yes: And how? by quoting my Acknowledgment, that they are differently un-

^s p. 66, 67. ^b D. L. Vol. I. p. 410, 411. Ed. 2. ⁱ p. 67.

derstood by learned Men. And now Reader! what dost thou imagine our Advocate capable of?

X.

He goes on.—And because the Philosophers, speaking of the Soul, often call it the Image of God, divine and immortal, &c. he would lead the Reader, from such Expressions, unwarily to imagine, that it was literally a Part of God, eternal à parte antè, the same as the Soul of the World, &c. But I hope to make the Contrary appear by some plain Testimonies of Antiquity: and the first I shall produce is one Mr. W. himself has helped me to, and is from Stobæus, where Speusippus, one of Plato's Followers, says, “that the Mind was neither the same with the One or the Good, but had a peculiar Nature of its own.” This Mr. W. owns, expressly contradicts what he asserted of Plato's holding the Soul to be Part of God; “but he says that Stobæus and the learned Stanley were both mistaken in thinking Speusippus spoke of the human Mind, whereas, says he, it relates to the third Person in the Trinity.” Now supposing we take Mr. Warburton's Judgment before that of Stobæus or Stanley, we may still fairly conclude, that if even the third Person in the Trinity was not the same as God, but had a peculiar Nature of his own, much less was the Soul of Man the same; but that it had a distinct Nature likewise^k. — He would lead, says he, the Reader by such Expressions unwarily to imagine, that it was literally a part of God. Hear then, by what kind of Expressions I would mislead the unwary Reader. *A natura Deorum* (says Cicero) *ut doctissimis sapientissimisque placuit, haustos animos & libatos habemus.* And again, *Humanus autem animus decerptus ex Mente divina, cum alio nullo nisi cum ipso Deo comparari potest*^l. — He will not dispute whether Stobæus and Stanley, or I, be in the right. He does well. But then he says, *We may still FAIRLY CONCLUDE, that if even the third Person in the Trinity was not the same as God, but had a peculiar Nature of his own, much less was the Soul of Man the same; but that it had a distinct Nature likewise.* Such a Concluder would have made Aristotle

^k p. 67, 68. ^l D. L. p. 405. Ed. 2.

forswear Syllogism. In the 404 Page of the first Volume of the *Divine Legation* he saw these Words: “ Again, “ the Maintainers of the *Immateriality* of the Divine Substance were likewise divided into two Parties; the first “ of which held but *one* Person in the Godhead; the other “ *two* or *three*. SO THAT AS THE FORMER BELIEVED “ THE SOUL TO BE PART OF THE SUPREME GOD; “ THE LATTER BELIEVED IT TO BE PART ONLY OF “ THE SECOND OR THIRD HYPOSTASIS.” What is to be done with this Prevaricator? Will he plead guilty to have the Benefit of his Clergy? Or will he own he could not read, and so stand upon his Defence? — “ You may complain (I hear him say) but whose Fault is it? You had “ put this Passage amongst your *nice Distinctions, Divisions, and Subdivisions*: And those I was not obliged to “ take notice of, after having so fairly given you Warning that I *passed over* all such as *needless Curiosities*.”

But I begin to be quite weary of my Advocate; I am drawing towards a *Conclusion* with him, and will dispatch him with all possible Expedition. What follows won't stay us long. *As to the Passage which he quotes from M. Antoninus, it is nothing more than an Exhortation to consider what will become of the Soul when it is disunited or separated from the Body; and though Mr. W. makes him to speak of its being resolved into the Anima Mundi; yet he owns at the same Time, that neither Gataker in his Notes, or Casaubon, had any Notion that the Doctrine of Refusion was here alluded to^m. Gataker and Casaubon did not understand it in my Sense. Does he pretend to say I understand it wrong? He pretends to know nothing of the Matter: So I leave it to those who do. For I should have a strange Love for answering, if I gave this any other Reply than Antoninus's own Words: “ [To die] is not “ only according to the Course of Nature, but of great “ Use to it. [We should consider] how closely Man “ is united to the Godhead, and in what Part of him that “ Union resides; and what will be the Condition of that “ Part or Portion of it when it is resolved [into the Anima Mundi]ⁿ.*

^m p. 68. ⁿ D. L. p. 415. Ed. 2.

The next Authority (says he) I shall produce, is from PLOTINUS, who tells us that the Soul is from God; and therefore necessarily loves him, yet it is a different Existence from him. Here again he plays his old Trick upon us. Plotinus, a Philosopher deep in the Times of Christianity. I have tried in vain to make him understand. I will try now if I can make him blush; while he forces me to repeat, for the second Time, the following Words of the *Divine Legation*. "Such was the general Doctrine on "this Point" [namely, that the Soul was God, or Part of God] before the coming of Christianity, "but then those "Philosophers, who held out against its Truth, after some "Time new-modelled both their Philosophy and Reli- "gion; making their Philosophy more religious, and "their Religion more philosophical. — So amongst the "many Improvements of Paganism, THE SOFTENING "THIS DOCTRINE WAS ONE. The modern Platonists "confining the Notion of the Soul's being Part of the "Divine Substance to that of Brutes.—— And it is re- "markable that then, and not till then, the Philosophers "began really to believe the Doctrine of a future State^d." How true this is we may see by this very Quotation from Plotinus. And one of common Apprehension would have seen, by his Words, yet it is a different Existence from him, that this was an Innovation in Philosophy. For were it not the common Opinion, that the Soul was of the same Existence with God, or Part of him, this Caution and Explanation had been impertinent. However, he goes on unmercifully to shew the Orthodoxy of Plotinus, and of his Commentator Ficinus, in this Point: Where speaking I don't know what, nor why, of the vegetative Soul, he takes an Opportunity to criticise a Passage I brought from Plutarch. Of this Soul [namely the vegetative] it is of which Plutarch manifestly speaks, where he says, "that "Pythagoras and Plato held the Soul to be immortal; for "that launching out into the Soul of the Universe, it re- "turned to its Parent and Original." THAT THIS MUST BE INTENDED OF THE VEGETATIVE SOUL IS PLAIN, from his mentioning two other Souls from the same Autho-

rities, immediately after in a quite different Light. “Pythagoras and Plato, says he, hold that the rational Soul is immortal; for that this Soul is not God, but the Workmanship of the Eternal God; and it is the irrational Soul which is mortal and corruptible.” So that unless we can suppose Plutarch intended to make Pythagoras and Plato contradict themselves, we must conclude their Opinions in this Passage to be, that the vegetative Soul was diffused into the Life of the Universe; that the sensitive or irrational Soul was mortal and corruptible; and that the rational Soul was a distinct Existence made by God. But this last Part is not at all taken notice of by Mr. Warburton, tho’ in the very same Paragraph with the first which he quotes ^q.

1. Unless we can suppose (says he) Plutarch intended to make Pythagoras and Plato contradict themselves. Suppose, Quotha! Did he never hear that this Plutarch wrote an express Treatise on the Contradictions of the Stoics? A Sect of as good a House as either Pythagoras or Plato. Will he never see, that if the Philosophers had a double Doctrine, which he has laboured to prove, they must perpetually contradict themselves? But our Advocate is so captivated a Lover^r, so enamoured of his dear Philosophers, that the very Air of a Contradiction thocks him.

2. Well then, not to disgust the Delicacy of a Lover, I will humour him. It shall be no Contradiction; nor will I suppose Plutarch such a Brutal as to insinuate any thing so gross. But now, if, like a true Inamorato, he will not suffer them to be defended by any Hand but his own, then we shall begin to differ. He tells us that when Plutarch says Pythagoras and Plato held the Soul to be immortal, IT IS PLAIN THIS MUST BE INTENDED OF THE VEGETATIVE SOUL.—An immortal vegetative Soul! ’Tis a Prodigy that deserves an Expiation. But to know whether Plutarch or our Advocate be the real Father of this Monster, it will be necessary to transcribe the whole Chapter: “Pythagoras and Plato held the Soul to be immortal; for that lanching out into the Soul of the Universe, it returns to its Parent and Original. The Stoics say, that on its leaving the Body, the more infirm (that is, the Soul of

^q p. 70, 71.

^r See his Pref. p. v.

“ *the Ignorant*) suffers the Lot of the Body : But the
 “ more vigorous (*that is, the Soul of the Wise*) endures
 “ to the Conflagration. *Democritus* and *Epicurus* say the
 “ Soul is mortal, and perishes with the Body : *Pythagoras*
 “ and *Plato*, that the reasonable Soul is uncorrupt (*for it*
 “ *is to be observed, the Soul is not God, but the Workman-*
 “ *ship of the Eternal God*) and the irrational mortal.”

1. Πυθαγόρας, Πλάτων, ἀφθάρτου ἢ τὴν ψυχὴν· ἐξῆσαν γὰρ εἰς τὸ
 ὅλον ψυχὴν ἀναχωρεῖν πρὸς τὸ ὁμογενές. Οἱ Στωικοὶ, ἐξῆ-
 σαν τῷ σώματι ὑποφέρεσθαι, τὴν μὲν ἀσθενέστεραν ἅμα τοῖς συσκέ-
 μασι θνήσκειν· (ταύτην ἢ τῷ ἀπαιδύτῳ) τὴν δὲ ἰχυροτέραν, οἷα
 εἰς περὶ τῆς σοφίας, καὶ μέχρι τῆς ἐμπυρώσεως. Δημόκριτος, Ἐπί-
 κρουτος, φθαρτὴν, τὴν σῶματι συνδιαφθειρομένην. Πυθαγόρας καὶ
 Πλάτων, τὴν μὲν λογικὴν, ἀφθάρτου (ΚΑΙ ΓΑΡ ἡ ψυχὴ, ὡς θεὸν, ἄλλ’
 ἔργον δὲ αἰδίου θεοῦ ὑπάρχειν) τὴν δὲ ἄλογον, φθαρτὴν. Περὶ τῷ
 Ἀρεσ. τοῖς φιλ. Βιβλ. δ’. Κ. ζ.

Here we see, the Soul first mentioned, and said to be *immortal*, and to lanch out into the Soul of the Universe, was the same which the Stoics held to endure, when it had been in their wise Man, till the Conflagration ; was the same which *Democritus* and *Epicurus* held to be mortal. And was this the VEGE-TATIVE Soul? How hard has the World dealt with *Demo-critus* and *Epicurus* for twenty round Ages, only for hold-ing that the *vegetative Soul was mortal*? A very reason-able Opinion, had there been any *vegetative Soul* at all. But what then must we say to the *Contradiction*, which I have promised to remove, and which seems now quite fixed, since we have evaporated this Spirit of *vegetative Immortality*, from the Passage? The plain Solution of the Difficulty is this : When *Plutarch* had mentioned the im-pious Notion of the Soul’s *Mortality*, first started by *De-mocritus* and *Epicurus*, he opposes it by that of *Pythago-ras* and *Plato*. He had told us before, that these held the Soul to be *immortal* : But now, using their Autho-rity to confute the other *two*, he, like a judicious Writer, explains it with more Exactness. He tells us, that *Pytha-goras* and *Plato* held the *reasonable* Soul to be immortal, the *irrational* mortal. When, in the Beginning of the Chapter, he had said, they held the Soul to be immortal, he added *their Reason, For that lanching out, &c.* ΓΑΡ εἰς τὸ τῷ ὁλον, &c. Now her, in the Conclusion, men-tioning again the same Dogma, he adds *his own, For it*

is to be observed the Soul is not God, &c. ΚΑΙ ΓΑΡ ἡ ψυχὴ, &c. For *Plutarch* had, with the rest of the Philosophers of the Christian Times, refined his Notions on this Matter: They said, the Soul was immortal, because it was related to the Soul of the Universe: He said, it was immortal, because it was the Work of God. *Hen. Stephens*, who, it seems probable, saw this was *Plutarch's*, and not *Pythagoras's* or *Plato's* Philosophy, makes the Words (καὶ ὅτι ψυχὴ ἡ θεὸν ἀλλὰ τὴν αἰδὴς θεὸν ὑπάρχειν) a Parenthesis, as he does (ταύτῃ τῇ ἡ ἀπαυδούτων) and as he should have done οἷα ἐστὶ περὶ τῆς σοφίας; both which are the explanatory Remarks of *Plutarch*. And now it is to be hoped our Advocate sees why this last Part was not at all taken notice of by *Mr. Warburton*, tho' in the very same Paragraph with the first which he quoted. But what does he now see of his Contradiction?

We have said what it was that induced *Plutarch* to interfere with his own Opinion in this Matter. The very same Concern for the Orthodoxy of old Pagan Philosophy (then to be opposed to Christianity) that now seems to distress our Advocate. The very same that made *Platinus* cry out, as above, *The Soul necessarily loves God, yet is a different Existence from him*. And this will account for *Plutarch's* labouring so much as he does, in the Place quoted by our Advocate, at his 75th Page, to free *Plato* from the Charge of making the Soul eternal and uncreated. For a Charge, it seems, it was, and a heavy one too, upon him. Now where *Plutarch* performs the faithful Office of an Historian, in delivering us the *Placits* of the old Philosophers, there, we see, he owns both *Pythagoras* and *Plato* held this Opinion; but here, where he acts the Advocate, I mean of old Pagan Philosophy, he endeavours to distinguish away the Accusation. Thus at length we see the Contradiction lies at *Plutarch's* Door; which will require more than a vegetative Immortality to remove: *Leguleio dignus vindice Nodus*.

These three Passages, from *Stobæus*, *M. Antoninus*, and *Plutarch*, are the only three of the great Number I brought to prove the Greek Philosophers held the Soul to be Part of God, which our Advocate has ventured to undertake.

These

These he thought he could manage : And Envy must own he has acquitted himself to Admiration.

XI.

But that *Plato* was orthodox in this Point, he will now shew from *Plato* himself.—*And that this was Plato's Opinion* (says he) *concerning the human rational Soul, I shall further prove — from himself.* — In one Place he says, “*We have spoke most truly in asserting the Soul was made before the Body, and the Body in the second Place, and after the Soul, forasmuch as the governing Part ought in Point of Time to be created before that which is governed.*” Where says he this? Where think you but in the old Place, his *Book of Laws*? 'Tis an odd Fancy this, in our Advocate, to go so continually to a *Book of Laws* for *Plato's* religious Sentiments. *Law and Gospel*, let me tell him, agreed no better formerly than they do now. But he must needs go as his *Index* led him. Which in this Road always points *exoterically*. Let us follow him then into his Ware-house of *Laws*. Here, to our great Surprize, we find, that *Plato* is not speaking of the Origin of the human rational Soul, but of a very different Thing. This *tenth Book of Laws*, from whence he takes his Quotation, is employed to prove the Being of a God against Atheism. One of his Arguments, for an *eternal Mind*, is, That that is the first efficient Cause which moves itself and all other Things. But MIND moves itself and all other Things : Therefore MIND is the first efficient. Hence, in the Words of the Quotation, it is inferred, *That the Soul was before the Body*, *Ψυχὴν μὲν πρὸν ἔργον γεγονέναι σώματος ἡμῶν.* And farther, that there is one general Soul or Mind, that governs the Universe, *Ψυχὴν δὲ διοικῆσαν ἐν ἅπασιν τοῖς πάντη κινεμύοις μῶν ἔκ τ' ἔργον ἀνάγκη διοικεῖν φάναι* ; Now, who sees not that it was *Plato's* Business here, to shew only in the *Abstract*, that Mind was prior to Body ; and altogether besides his Purpose to speak of the Origin of the human Soul ? Yet our Advocate, misled by the *Latin* Translator, and unaided by any Discernment of his own, makes *Plato's*

Words relate to the Creation of the Soul. *That the Soul was MADE before the Body; Animum ante Corpus FACTUM fuisse.* But *Plato* in his *Epinomis*, referring to this very Place, explains the Meaning in these Words: *That every Soul is elder than every Body; ὅτι πρεσβύτερον εἴη ψυχὴ σώματος ἢ ἅπαντα σώματα.* Yet was this Passage so far from helping our Advocate to the true Sense of his Quotation, that he even refers to it for the Confirmation of his Mistake. All therefore that *Plato's* Argument required was to prove, that *Mind* was before *Body*. But had he thought proper to digress about the *Origin* of the Soul, he must needs have made it *ungenerated*, from a Principle he lays down in this very Place, namely, *That the Soul was a self-moving Substance; Τὸ ἐαυτὸ κινεῖν φησὶ λόγον ἔχειν ἢ αὐτὸν ἐστίαν, ἥπερ τ' εἶνομα ὁ δὴ πάντες ψυχῶν προσαγορεύομεν;* for a *self-moving* and an *eternal-moving* Substance were the same Thing amongst the Ancients. So *Plutarch* tells us, that *Thales* was the first who taught the Soul to be an eternal-moving OR self-moving Nature, *Θαλῆς ἀπετήνητο πρῶτον ἢ ψυχῶν φύσιν ἀεικίνητον ἢ αὐτοκίνητον.*

Our Advocate goes on with his *Plato*: In another Place, (says he) God, after having made the ANGELS, is introduced as delivering them Materials to form Man and other Animals, and as speaking to them in this Manner: “Go to then, turn yourself to the Formation of Animals, according to the Laws of Nature, and imitate that efficacious Power which I myself used in your Production; and since they will be created as it were Fellow-Citizens with yourselves, they shall be esteemed of divine Extract, and shall have Dominion over all other Creatures.”

I. God, after having made the ANGELS (says he.) Would the Reader know what Sort of Angels he has here to do with? Our Advocate is silent. But honest *Plato* tells us their Names: *Saturn, Rhea, Jupiter, Juno*, and the rest of the Pagan Gods and Demons. *Περὶ ὧν ἄλλων δαιμόνων εἰπεῖν — Γῆς τε καὶ Οὐρανοῦ παῖδες Ωκεανὸς τε καὶ Τηθύς ἐχθυρόεντες ἐκ τῶν ὧν, Φόρκυς τε καὶ Κρόνος καὶ Ῥέα, &c.* But if *Philosophers* are to pass for *Apostles*, why may not *Heathen Gods* stand for *Angels*? Of these holy Angels *Plato* says it would

* *Plat. Phil. l. 4. c. 2.*

“ p. 72.

be Impiety not to *believe* what the ancient Mythologists taught concerning them, ΠΕΙΣΤΕΟΝ ὃ τοῖς εἰρηκόσιν ἔμπροσθεν, ἀγγέλοις μὲν θεῶν εἶσιν ὡς ἔφασαν, σαφῶς δὲ παρὰ τὰς αὐτῶν πρῶτον εἰδέναι· ἀδυνάτον δὲ θεῶν παρὶν ἀπιστεῖν. Being now in this Humour, he tells us, that when God created Souls he disposed them *amongst the Stars*. ζυγήσας ὃ τὸ πᾶν διέλε ψυχὰς ἰσαριθμῶν τοῖς ἀστέροις, ἐνείμεν' ἐκάστῳ πρὸς ἕκαστον. — That they suffered *Transmigration into Brutes*, — ἐνθα καὶ εἰς θηρία βίον ἀνθρωπίνην ψυχὴν ἀφικνεῖται· μὴ παυόμενοι ὃ ἐν ταῖς ἐτι κακίας, τρέπον ἐν κακόνοις, καὶ τὴν ὁμοιότητά τ' εἰς τρέπον ἡμέσεως, εἰς τινὰ τοιαύτῳ ἀνὰ μελαβαλλεῖ θηρία φύσιν. And is not this a likely Place to find *Plato's real Sentiments* concerning the Soul?

2. But what do we talk of his real Sentiments? The Book, from whence our Advocate brings this Passage, contains not *Plato's Sentiments* at all, but another Man's, one *Timæus Locrus*, of whose Book, *de Anima Mundi*, this Work of *Plato's* is a *Comment*. The Passage in Question, particularly, being a *Paraphrase* on these Words of *Timæus*, ΜΕΤΑ ὃ τὰν τῷ κόσμῳ σύστασιν, &c. ^w.

But our Advocate, now grievously bemired, yet flounders on.—And again PLATO MUCH TO THE SAME PURPOSE SAYS, “that after God had formed the World, he “allotted the human Soul to be disposed of by Nature, as his “Vicegerent,” &c. ^x. Can the Reader now guess whither we are sent to look for these Words?—To 3 *Plat.* 99. D. which fairly brings us a Mile beyond *Plato*, to a Treatise of *Timæus Locrus*, intitled *De Anima Mundi*. The swallowing *Sigonius* for *Cicero* was a Trifle to this Exploit. Here he saw writ in fair *Latin Characters*, over the Page, *Timæi Locride Anima Mundi*. If one did not know him, one should take him to be of the Humour of that Critic, who had a great mind that every thing that was good should be his *Favourite Author's*. But he was puzzled with the two Titles. One was, the *Timæus* of *Plato*; the other, the *Anima Mundi* of *Timæus*. This was the deep Problem of the *Horse-mill*, and *Mill-horse*: But the best of the Story is, he here again (as in the former Case of the *Book of Laws* and *Epinomis*) brings these Words of *Timæus* to confirm his Sense of the foregoing Quotation from the

^w *Plato Serr.* Vol. III. p. 99.

^x p. 73.

Timæus of Plato; and says, as well he might, 'tis much to the same Purpose. This I remark to the Honour of his Penetration. For tho' he did not know one was the *Text* and the other the *Comment*, yet he found out by mere Dint of Sagacity, that they were very near a-kin. And this is all the Fruit of his *Platonic* Journey. Unhappy Advocate! What a Progress hast thou made! from *Plato* nothing to the Purpose, to no *Plato* at all! But we had best stop here, lest the next Quotation should be from *No Body*. And indeed 'tis next to *no body*; 'tis from *Apuleius*, a Writer in the *Christian Times*. A Trick, now too stale even to laugh at.

We are come at last to our Advocate's *Peroration*. And to say the Truth, it was Time for him to have done. *Therefore, after all this* (says he) *Mr. Warburton need not any longer admire, &c.* No truly, he has eased me of this Passion, The *Admiring* at a Free-thinker. — *It is very true, that some few Expressions now and then may be found in the Writings of the Philosophers, as, that the Soul is a Part of God; comes from God; is discerped from him; is a Ray of the Divinity; is one with God; &c. if taken in a strict literal Sense, might in some Measure answer Mr. Warburton's Purpose: BUT WHEN THE LITERAL SENSE IS PLAINLY ABSURD, and the Contrary maintained by a Multitude of clear Expressions, we of course understand them FIGURATIVELY.* Without doubt. So that when we are told *Epicurus* held the Sun and Moon to be no bigger than they seem; *Pyrro*, that nothing could be known; and *Zeno*, that all Crimes were equal, *the literal Sense being plainly absurd*, we must believe nothing of the Matter. But as he hath talked of the *figurative* Terms of a Language, in which he understands no Terms at all, he should now learn to hold his Tongue, and hearken to his Teachers. The great *Gassendi* was incomparably the best versed in ancient *Greek* Philosophy of any Man in these latter Ages, and he never dreamt of this more than *figurative* Folly of our Advocate. He knew the *Greek* and *Latin* Expressions would bear no such Interpretation: And therefore tells us roundly, that there was scarce an

ancient Philosopher, who was not what we now call a Spinozist. “ *Interim* (says he) *tamen VIX ULLI fuere* “ (*quæ humanæ Mentis Caligo, atque Imbecillitas est*) *qui* “ *non inciderint in Errorem illum de REFUSIONE IN ANI-* “ *MAM MUNDI. Nimirum, sicut existimarunt SINGULO-* “ *RUM ANIMAS PARTICULAS ESSE ANIMÆ MUNDANÆ,* “ *quarum quælibet suo Corpore, ut Aqua Vase, includeretur;* “ *ita & reputarunt unamquamque Animam, Corpore dissoluto,* “ *quasi diffraëto Vase, effluere, ac ANIMÆ MUNDI E* “ *QUA DEDUCTA FUERIT, ITERUM UNIRI* ².”

And now, after all that has passed between us, I may be allowed at parting to ask my nameless Adversary what he is? His betters, when they went *incognito*, have been thus questioned, and without Offence. The great *Pythagoras* himself was asked it, and his Answer will fit our Advocate as if it had been made for him. And that he may not be forced to descend from his present Dignity of Quotation, I will press him no farther, but suppose he gives an Enquirer this, that his ancient Master made to *Leon*, Prince of the *Phliasians*, who asked him what he was. ART, (says he) *I know none; but I am a PHILOSOPHER* ³.

XII.

Let us conclude with a general View of our Advocate's Performances. He will write against the *third Book of the divine Legation of Moses*: But proposes only to consider what in *his Apprehension* affects the Argument. Yet of this little, for his *Apprehension* is not much, he has not considered one tenth Part. And how that abounds in all kind of *false Reasoning*, and *absurd Quotation*, we have given the Reader a kind of Specimen. But to make amends for an imperfect Representation, he may be pleased to take notice, that, besides all particular local Graces, there are FOUR GENERAL FALLACIES, that run throughout this noble Work. Two in Point of *Quotation*, two of *Reasoning*.

I. The first is in quoting Poets, or any body, instead of Philosophers.

² *Div. Leg. Vol. I. p. 408. Ed. 2.* ³ *Artem quidem se scire nullam; sed esse Philosophum. Cic. Tus. Disp. l. 5. c. 3.*

- II. The second in quoting Philosophers after *Christ*.
- III. The third in urging *exoteric* Doctrines for *esoteric*.
- IV. And the fourth in concluding from what was said of *false* Gods, to what they thought of the *true*.

I call these by the knavish Title the *Schools* of Philosophy have given them, which, like the *Courts of Law*, make no Provision for Fools: But, upon my Word, I am not satisfied whether they be not very honest *Blunders*. However, he has now his Choice to call them what he will, so he no longer pretend to call them Arguments.

His *first* Chapter, as I said, is the only one with which I am concerned. His *second* is intitled, *The Opinions of the Philosophers concerning a future State*. It is made up of some six dozen of ill chosen Quotations, which so amazed him that he could not forbear saying on the Entrance to his Labour, *It seems very surprizing, notwithstanding all the following Authorities, and many more which no doubt this learned Gentleman must have met with to the contrary, that he should thus speak of the Philosophers: "I have examined their Writings with all the Exactness I was able, and it appears evident to me that these Men believed nothing of a future State of Rewards and Punishments, which they most industriously propagated in Society."* By this Time, I suppose, I have eased him of his *Surprize*: So that we are now even by a reciprocal Cure. In one Point however he is right. He supposes I could have furnished him with *many more Authorities*. I could, I'll assure him: More than with six hundred to his six dozen. But it is pleasant to observe, in this *Chapter of Quotations*, with what Judgment he brings in three *Epicureans*, *Virgil*, *Lucian*, and *Celsus*, to bear Witness to a future State of Rewards and Punishments, who without doubt *believed* what they said. Honest *Celsus* cries out, under the *Mask* and in the *Tone* of a modern Free-thinker, *God forbid, that either they, or I, or any Man living, should endeavour to subvert the Belief of a future State of Rewards and Punishments*^c. Who, when he hears

^b p. 2.

^c p. 152.

this, can forbear concluding with our Advocate, — *I say, when a Man talks in this manner, it is hardly possible not to imagine him in Earnest*^d.

I call this his *Chapter of Quotations*. 'Tis its proper Title: 'Tis made up of them, and a jolly Company they are, but so transcendently chosen and translated, that some Time or other it may chance to become as famous as *Scarron's Chapter of Horse-Litters*, which once, indeed, on a Time met together because they were forced; but for all that each of them, while in the Disposal of their Owners, was taking a different Road. At present I shall only desire the Reader to observe, that the *three first* of the *four general Sophisms* shine throughout this Chapter with a distinguished Lustre.

He has two more *Chapters* upon something or other; and then concludes with a Pastoral-Letter to the Free-thinkers, *Ut SOBRII ad evertendam Rempublicam Christianam accederent*.

Thus it hath been my Fortune to displease the *Bigots* on both Sides. I make no Question, but the impartial Reader will be ready to congratulate with me on so fair an Appearance of being in the Right.

As for this fantastic Zealot in the Cause of Paganism, I have used him, 'tis true, with little Ceremony. Let the Reader judge, if he deserved more. I had put my Name to what I wrote, and he attacks me in secret. Had either I concealed mine, or he told his, he might then have expected (if on other Accounts he had a Right to it) what the usual Commerce of Civility demands between People upon equal Terms: But writing without a Name, in the Manner he has done, is least of all excusable. For, when a Man's Person or Reputation is attacked, I know little Difference between the Ruffian, and the Writer, in the Dark.

I may be the rather allowed to speak freely on this Head, because I never yet wrote against any Book or Author whatsoever, any farther than occasional Reflections on particular Questions, which no one can avoid who treats of Subjects like those I am engaged in. Once in-

deed, and but once, I took upon myself the Honour of *defending* a sublime Genius against the Cavils of an injurious Pedant. But an *Attack* by *Answer, Remarks, Confutation*, or any of the formal Apparatus of literary Assault, I never made on any Author whatsoever. To say the Truth, I prize my Ease and Quiet at too high a Rate, to hazard them in the Vain or *interested* Employment of discrediting any Popular or Party Writer whatsoever.—
Nec quisquam noceat Cupido mihi Pacis!

I should now, perhaps, crave Pardon of the severer Reader for the Levities that have escaped me both *here* and in the *Preface*. But if he that loses may have leave to speak, sure he that's libel'd, tho' he loses nothing, may have leave to laugh. And what else was to be done with my *Doctor and Student*, who, whether they railed or reasoned, how much soever in their own Professions, were still on the wrong Side common Sense and common Honesty. For they have managed Things so well, that the one has lost his *Reasoning* in the Study of the *Law*, and the other his *Charity* in Defence of the *Gospel*. Besides, on some Occasions, what Mortal can forbear? Who would have suspected our solemn tragic Doctor for a *risible Animal*? Yet there are Seasons, when his own Blunders dispose him to be jocular, and he irreverently aims at Wit with the Face of an *Irish Inquisitor*^e.

In Conclusion, *If any Man* (to use the Words of a great Writer) EQUAL TO THE MATTER^f, *shall think it appertains him to take in Hand this Controversy, either excepting against aught written, or persuaded he can shew better how this Question may receive a true Determination; if his Intent be sincere to the Public, and shall carry him on without BITTERNESS to the OPINION or to the PERSON dis-*

^e See the *Weekly Miscellany* throughout. ^f Mr. Chubb, I am told, has addressed something or other to me at the End of his late *Discourse on Miracles*. I suppose he only wants my Acknowledgments; and he shall have them: For the reason above shews why I must always decline his kind Overtures of farther Acquaintance. I confess then he is a very extraordinary Person: and think he may say with the subtil *Peasant* in *Moliere*—*Où, si j'avois étudié, j'aurois été songer à des choses où l'on n'a jamais songé.*

senting, let him not, I intreat him, guess by the Handling which meritoriously hath been bestowed on these Objects of Contempt and Laughter, that I account it any Displeasure done me to be contradicted in Print: But as it leads to the Attainment of any thing more true, shall esteem it a Benefit; and shall know how to return his **CIVILITY** and **FAIR ARGUMENT** in such Sort, as he shall confess that to do so is my Choice, and to have done thus was my Chance.

POST-

POST-SCRIPT.

I.

TO put Things of a Sort together, I shall take this Occasion to pay my Respects to the Author of the *Principles and Connexion of natural and revealed Religion*^a, who has honoured me, in passing, with a couple of random Reflexions. A kind of Fatality seems to attend these Gentlemen; who, when I lie so open to them, have still the Luck to offer at me in the wrong Place.

In his 399th Page he has these Words: “ It is not of
 “ any Moment to enter further into what Philosophers
 “ have said, when they attempt to account for the Soul’s
 “ *Eternity*. Common Sense taught them, that real pro-
 “ per Punishments were inflicted upon Men for Sins.
 “ Who can read *Plato’s Gorgias*, (which is not ranked
 “ amongst the *Exoterics* by a late Writer, in which alone
 “ the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and Punish-
 “ ments, he thinks, are [is] detailed out) who can read
 “ that, and conceive that *Plato* did not really believe a
 “ State of future Punishments and Rewards? When he
 “ had professed at large, how wicked Men are punished,
 “ and how good Men are rewarded in a future State, he
 “ declares *That to be his full Persuasion, and from thence*
 “ *it was, that he endeavoured to appear before his Judge*
 “ *having a most pure Soul*. And if they imagined Men to
 “ be punished for Sin, and rewarded for Virtue, even sup-
 “ posing this was talked of in a Way that might be proved
 “ fabulous, yet the Doctrine itself was unshaken. Sup-
 “ pose the Fables of *Acheron*, and *Styx*, and *Cocytus*, and
 “ *Elysian Fields*, may be all demonstrated to be false; yet
 “ it does not follow, that the Thing conveyed under these

^a *Arthur Ashley Sykes, D. D.*

“ Words

“ Words were [was] believed to be all false. It does
 “ not follow that Souls were believed to die, or to be
 “ incapable of receiving Punishments or Rewards: but
 “ only that this Manner of representing them is false ^b.” —
 These are his Words; and they deserve to be well con-
 sidered.

*It is not of any Moment (he says) to enter further into
 what Philosophers have said, when they attempt to account
 for the Soul's ETERNITY. I thought it of great Moment.
 I am sure I found it of great Difficulty. And if I have ill
 explained what the Philosophers meant by the Soul's Eter-
 nity, one Reason was, that I wanted more Helps than Anti-
 quity would afford me. But it is the Privilege of veteran
 Disputers, to want nothing but willing Hearers. But why
 will he enter no further, when he goes out of his Way to
 pay me this Visit?*

Because *common Sense* (he says) *taught them, that real
 proper Punishments were inflicted upon Men for Sins.* I have
 shewn from *Fact* that common Sense did not teach them.
 No matter: He will prove from *Reason* that it did. His
 Argument is plain and simple. Common Sense *might*
 teach them: therefore common Sense *did* teach them.
 This it is to be a practised Disputant. It is but knowing
 what common Sense *might* teach, and he will presently
 tell you, by his Scale of Logic, what it *did*. By the
 same way, I make no doubt, he could prove that the *Epi-
 cureans* believed a Providence; the *Stoics* Inequality of
 Crimes; and the *Pyrrhonians* the Certainty of Truth. He
 has only to shew that *common Sense taught them, or was*
ready to teach them; and we have only to believe, that
they were as ready to learn. I had myself a kind of Guess,
that common Sense might have taught the Philosophers that
real proper Punishments were inflicted upon Men for Sins;
 and had I known no more of Antiquity than this Writer
 has entered into, 'tis ten to one but I had concluded as he
 does, *that common Sense did teach them.* Tho' hardly, I
 think, after another had clearly shewn the Contrary from
 Antiquity. However, the Reader may not be displeased
 to hear how much I gave to *common Sense* in the Intro-
 duction to my Discourse on the *Philosophers.* These were

^b p. 400.

my Words: — “ It will be proper to premise, that the
 “ Constitution of the *Greek* Philosophy being above mea-
 “ sure refined and speculative, it always used to be deter-
 “ mined by *metaphysical* rather than *moral* Principles ;
 “ and to stick to all Consequences, how absurd soever,
 “ that were seen to arise from such Principles. Of this
 “ we have a famous Instance in the ancient *Democritic*
 “ Philosophy, &c.——So well supported; we see, is that
 “ Censure which a celebrated *French* Writer passes upon
 “ them: *When the Philosophers once besot themselves with*
 “ *a Prejudice, they are even more incurable than the People*
 “ *themselves: because they besot themselves not only with*
 “ *the Prejudice, but with the false Reasoning employed to*
 “ *support it.* The Reverence and Regard to *metaphysical*
 “ Principles being so great, we shall see, that the *Greek*
 “ Philosophers must of necessity reject the Doctrine of a
 “ future State of Rewards and Punishments, how many
 “ *invincible* moral Arguments soever there really be in
 “ Support of it, when we come to shew, that there were
 “ two *metaphysical* Principles concerning *God* and the
 “ *Soul*, universally embraced by all, which necessarily ex-
 “ clude all Notion of a future State of Reward and Punish-
 “ ment.”

In the *Conclusion* I repeat the same Observation in the
 following Words: — “ These two Errors in the metaphy-
 “ fical Speculations of the Philosophers, concerning the
 “ Nature of God and of the Soul, were what necessarily
 “ kept them from giving Credit to a Doctrine highly pro-
 “ bable in itself, and rendered so even by themselves, from
 “ many moral Considerations, perpetually preached up to
 “ the People. But, as we observed before, it was their ill
 “ Fate to be determined, in their Opinions, rather by *me-*
 “ *taphysical* than *moral* Arguments. This is seen by com-
 “ paring the Belief and Conduct of SOCRATES with the
 “ rest. He was singular in confining himself to the Study
 “ of *Morality*, and as singular in *believing* the Doctrine of
 “ a future State of Reward and Punishment. What could
 “ be the Cause of this latter Singularity but the former? Of
 “ which it was a natural Consequence. For having thrown
 “ aside all other Speculations, he had nothing to mislead

Div. Leg. Vol. I. Ed. 2. p. 390, 391.

“ him;

“ him. Whereas the rest of the Philosophers applying them-
 “ selves with a kind of Fanaticism, to Physics and Metaphy-
 “ fics, had drawn a Number of absurd, tho’ subtile Conclu-
 “ sions, that directly opposed the Consequences of those
 “ moral Arguments. And as it is common for Parents to
 “ be fondest of their weakest and most deformed Offspring,
 “ so these Men, as we said, were always more swayed by
 “ their metaphysical than moral Conclusions^d.” Now this
 was all I could, in Conscience, allow to *common Sense*,
 when Antiquity stood so directly in my Way.

But lest it should be said he had overlooked *all* Fact, he
 has thought fit to make the following Observation: *Who*
can read Plato’s Gorgias, (which is not ranked amongst the
Exoterics by a late Writer, in which alone the Doctrine of a
future State of Rewards and Punishments, he thinks, is detailed
out) who can read that, and conceive that Plato did not really
believe, &c. The Force of this Observation, the Reader
 sees, lies in the Parenthesis, *that I have not ranked the Gor-*
gias of Plato amongst his Exoterics. But how, if this be false?
 Let the following Words of the *Divine Legation* determine:
 “ It is very true, that, in his Writings, he [*Plato*] incul-
 “ cates the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards and
 “ Punishments; but this always in the grossest Sense of
 “ the Populace, — *that the Souls of ill Men descended into*
 “ *Asses or Swine*, — that the uninitiated lay in Mire and
 “ Filth: that there were three Judges of Hell; and talks
 “ much of *Styx, Cocytus, Acheron, &c.* and all so *seriously*
 “ as shews he had a mind to be believed. But did he him-
 “ self believe them? We may be assured he did not^e.”
 Where, at the Word *seriously*, I expressly refer to the *GOR-*
GIAS, Phædo, and Republic. Now, if the *Phædo* and *Re-*
public (as he will not deny) be of the *exoteric* Kind, and I
 place the *Gorgias* in the same Class, is not this *ranking*
the Gorgias amongst the Exoterics? What then was it that
 could induce this Writer to say, I had not ranked it there?
 Was it the following Passage? “ But *Albinus*, an old
 “ *Platonist*, has, in some measure, supplied this Loss [name-
 “ *ly, the Loss of a Treatise of Numenius, concerning the*
 “ *secret Doctrine of Plato]* by his *Introduction to the Dia-*

^d p. 433, 434.

^e Vol. I. p. 373, 374. Ed. 2.

“ *logues*

“ *logues of Plato.* From whence it appears, that those
 “ very Books, in which *Plato* details out the Doctrine
 “ of a future State of Reward and Punishment, are all of
 “ the *exoteric* Kind. For in that *Class* *Albinus* ranks the
 “ *Criton, Phædo, Minos, Symposium, Laws, Epistles, E-*
 “ *pinomis, Menexenus, Clitophon, and Philebus* ^f.” If this
 were the Passage, ’tis plain the Writer mistook the latter
 Part for a formal List of *Plato’s exoteric* Writings. But
 the very Words might have taught him better : (I only
 say that in that *Class* *Albinus* ranks such and such Tracts).
 Especially if he had looked into the Discourse referred to :
 where he would have found the Reason why I expressed
 myself in that Manner. And I don’t use to write at ha-
 zard, as *hasty* as he thinks me. *Albinus*, in his fifth Sec-
 tion, divides *Plato’s* Dialogues into Classes. Not into the
 two general ones of *exoteric* and *esoteric* ; but into the
 more minute, and different, of *natural, moral, dialectic,*
confutative, civil, explorative, obstetric, and subversive ^g.
 It will be asked then, how I came to say, that *Albinus* ranked
 the *Criton, Phædo, Minos, Symposium, Laws, Epistles, Epi-*
nomis, Menexenus, Clitophon and *Philebus*, in the *exoteric*
Class ? For this plain Reason, he says they were all of the
civil Kind. And I hope I need not tell the learned Reader,
 that all of that Kind were *exoterical*. And now it is seen
 why I might well suppose the *Gorgias* of the *exoteric* Kind ;
 and yet, why I could not use *Albinus’s* Authority for placing
 it with the rest : Because it is evidently of the *civil* Class,
 and yet not ranked there by that old *Platonist*. The Reason
 of his different Assignment was this : The *Gorgias* is a Dia-
 logue concerning the Use and Abuse of Rhetoric. The So-
 phists had abused this Art to pervert public Justice, and
 to amass Wealth and Power. They are here shewn that
 its true Use was to aid and inforce the Laws, and to render
 the Members of a Community wiser and better. Hence, in
 Conclusion, the Author takes occasion to inforce the Prac-
 tice of Virtue from the Consideration of future Rewards

^f *Div. Leg.* Vol. I. p. 370, 371. Ed. 2^d.

^g Ταῖς μὲν φυσικαῖς, — ταῖς δὲ ἠθικαῖς, — ταῖς δὲ λογικαῖς, — ταῖς δὲ
 ἐλεγκτικαῖς, — ταῖς δὲ πολιτικαῖς, — ταῖς δὲ ποιητικαῖς, — ταῖς δὲ μαθη-
 τικαῖς, — ταῖς δὲ ἀντιρρητικαῖς. *Alb. Introd. in Plat. Dial. Sect. 5.*
apud Fabr. Bibl. Græc. lib. 3. c. 2.

and

and Punishments : his usual Manner of concluding his political Discourses ; the *Gorgias* being, indeed, properly a Supplement to the Books of *Law* and *Republic* : But it being at the same time altogether employed in overturning the Practice of the *Sophists*, was, I suppose, the Reason why *Albinus* thought it came more naturally into that Class which he calls *subversive*. This is a true Account of the *Gorgias* ; as well as of my plain Sentiments, concerning it, in the first Volume of the *Divine Legation*. And yet this Writer cries out, *Who can read the Gorgias, and conceive that Plato did not really believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments ?* Rather, let me ask, Who that has read the *Gorgias*, can talk at this rate ?

Well, but his Reason : “ When he [*Plato*] had professed at large, how wicked Men are punished, and how good Men are rewarded in a future State, he declares *that to be his full Persuasion, and from thence it was, that he endeavoured to appear before his Judge having a most pure Soul.*” The Original is, Ἐγὼ μὲν εἶναι, ὃ καλλίκλεις, ὑπο τοιούτων τῶν λόγων πείσασμαι, καὶ σκοπῶ ὅπως ἀποφανῶμαι τῷ κριτῇ ὡς ὑγιεστάτῳ ἔχων τὴν ψυχὴν. Here, we see, the Writer has sunk upon us the important Words ὑπὸ τέτων τῶν λόγων, upon which the whole Sentence turns. This could hardly be by Chance. The Reasons of the Omission are but too evident. Ἐγὼ μὲν εἶναι, ὃ καλλίκλεις, ὑπο τοιούτων τῶν λόγων πείσασμαι, *I am persuaded* (says the Speaker) *O Callicles, ON THE AUTHORITY OF THESE DOCTRINES.* Say you so ? To understand then how *full* the Persuasion was, we must consider what Credibility *these Doctrines* had. Now he that reads the *Gorgias* will find, that they consisted of a long fabulous Account of the *Establishment of the three Judges of Hell*^h : And of a strange Opinion, that the Dead not only retained the visible Marks of the Passions and Affections of the Soul, but also the Scars and Blemishes of the Bodyⁱ. It was on the Authority, therefore, of these goodly Doctrines, that the Speaker founds his Belief : and what is more, it was to these Doctrines that the very Words, in which he expresses this Belief, allude : ἀποφανῶμαι τῷ ΚΡΙΤΗ,

^h Tom. I. p. 523. Ed. Serr. See *Div. Leg.* Vol. I. p. 216, & seq. ⁱ *Ibid.* p. 524. See *Div. Leg.* Vol. I. p. 223. Ed. 2.

relating to the *infernal Judges*; and the ΥΓΙΕΣΤΑΤΗΝ Ψυχῇ, the *most sound or healthy Soul*, to its Affections, Marks and Blemishes. The Speaker therefore must of course believe a future State thus circumstanced, if he believed any future State at all. Here is no room for the Writer's Evasion: who supposes the Philosophers *might reject the Fables of Acheron, and Styx, and Cocytus, and Elysian Fields, and yet believe the Thing conveyed under these Words.* For here the Belief of the *Thing* is expressly said to be built on the Authority of those *Fables*: But those *Fables* our Author gives up as not really believed. By his Favour therefore I would conclude that the *Thing* built upon them was not believed.

But as I little thought this Writer would have had the better of me on the believing Side, I will suppose, as he does contrary to Evidence, that the Speaker did indeed in this Place deliver his real Sentiments. Let us see now what will come of it. He asks, *Who can read the Gorgias, and conceive, that Plato did not really believe, — when he has professed at large, —* So then; the Dispute between us is, Whether PLATO believed a future State of Rewards and Punishments? And, to prove that PLATO did, he gives me a Speech of SOCRATES. For unluckily what he quotes for the Words of *Plato* are the Words of his *Master*: who, I have endeavoured to shew, by better Reasons than such a kind of Speech, did really believe a future State of Rewards and Punishments.

But he goes on: — *And IF 'THEY IMAGINED Men to be punished for Sin, and rewarded for Virtue, even supposing that this was talked of in a Way that might be PROVED fabulous, yet the Doctrine itself was unshaken.* Without doubt, if I will allow *they imagined* a future State of Rewards and Punishments, he will prove *they believed* one; that being the Conclusion he seems to aim at in the awkward Expression of — *proved fabulous, and — was unshaken.* For the Point between us is not about what was *true* or *false*, but about what was *believed* or *disbelieved*. But he himself seems dissatisfied with his Expression, and therefore attempts to mend it in this Repetition, (for it would be hard that he who begs his Question, should not be able to get to his Conclusion). *Suppose the Fables of Acheron, and Styx, and Cocytus, and Elysian*

Elysian Fields, *may be all DEMONSTRATED to be false, yet it does not follow, that the Thing conveyed under these Words was believed to be all false.* Here again his Words, *demonstrated to be false*, leave him just where he was. For nothing can be concluded concerning the Philosophers believing or not believing a Thing, from our *demonstrating* it to be true or false. His Expression fails him here again. He therefore attempts it a *third* time. *It does not follow, that Souls were believed to die, or to be incapable of receiving Punishments or Rewards, but only that this manner of representing them IS FALSE.* As ill as ever! He is still in the very Place where he set out. And that which at first so perplexed him has stuck by him thro' all his Variation of Phrase — *Is false, for, was not believed.* As if the Philosophers must needs disbelieve all that was false, and believe all that was true. And indeed it seems to have been this strange Prepossession that has made him run into all his Confusion of Language. A Disease that fatally infected the Lawyer of late Memory. I put his Expressions in the most favourable Light. For if there be no Blunder, there is much Malice: The Period (supposing the Words accurate) tending to prove the *Credibility* of a Future State of Rewards and Punishments; which, being directed against my Discourse, necessarily insinuates, that I had wrote something against that *Credibility*. But I have too good Opinion of his Honesty, to believe this to be his secret Purpose.

What therefore this Writer so fruitlessly labours to bring forth, is this simple Conception, That the Philosophers might believe the Doctrine of a future State of Rewards Punishments in general, and yet disbelieve all the particular Fables of the Populace concerning it. But those who are acquainted with Antiquity, will know, that this *was not*, and *could not* be the Case. I have given a Reason in the first Volume of the *Divine Legation*, to shew, *it was not*, in these Words: “ We have given just above a Quotation from Tully’s Oration for Cluentius, in which he having
“ ridiculed the popular Fables concerning a future State, sub-
“ joins, *If these be false, as all Men see they are, what hath*
“ *Death deprived us of besides a Sense of Pain?* Nam nunc
“ quidem quid tandem illi mali Mors attulit? Nisi forte in-
“ *eptiis ac fabulis ducimur, ut existimemus illum apud Infe-*

“ros Impiorum supplicia perferre, &c. *Quæ si falsa sunt,*
 “*id quod omnes intelligunt, quid ei tandem aliud Mors eripuit*
 “*præter sensum doloris?* From this Inference of Cicero’s
 “it appears, that we have not concluded amiss, when, from
 “several Quotations, interspersed throughout this Work, in
 “which a Disbelief of the *common Notion* of a future State
 “of Rewards and Punishments is implied, we have inferred
 “the Writer’s Disbelief of a future State of Rewards and
 “Punishments in general^k.” There are many Reasons
 likewise, why it *could not be the Case*; too long indeed to
 mention here; however, I will just hint at one. The Pa-
 gan Notion of a future State of Rewards and Punishments
 was founded in old Tradition: But that Tradition, which
 conveyed down the general Doctrine, brought along these
Circumstances of it. But I forget, that I am arguing with
 an Enemy to all Tradition: Who, as highly as he ad-
 vances the Knowledge of the Philosophers, yet is un-
 willing to allow they were indebted for it to any thing
 but their own Reason. So entirely has that childish So-
 phism got the better of him: *Whatsoever Reason might*
teach, it did teach. But how has he made out his Point?
 By encountering a few weak Efforts of the *Fathers* in Sup-
 port of traditional Knowledge. He has great reason to
 boast his Victory: ’Tis like his who triumphed for
 having tript up a Cripple. But Reverence for Age should
 dispose us to spare the Fathers, especially when more able
 bodied Men stand in our Way. Till he meet with these,
 I would recommend the following Fact to his Considera-
 tion. The more ancient Philosophers, in the Delivery whe-
 ther of their moral, natural, or theologic Principles, con-
 stantly recommend them on this Footing, that they recei-
 ved them from TRADITION: One Truth came from a
Priest of this Religion; and another from the *sacred Books*
 of that. Scarce any thing is ever represented as the De-
 duction of their own Reasoning: Tho’ such a Represen-
 tation had been attended with much Honour, and we
 know they were immoderately fond of Glory. Now if
 this were the Case, I only ask, *Why should we not believe*
them?

^k p. 389.

II.

The Writer's second Remark begins thus: " It has
 " been maintained indeed by some, that all that the old
 " Philosophers held, was a natural *Metempsychosis*, or a
 " Transition from one Body to another, without any moral
 " Designation whatsoever. But surely this Conclusion is
 " too hasty: For when it was said, that the Souls of ill Men
 " descended into *Asses* or *Swine*, they did not suppose the
 " Souls of good Men so to descend. The Souls of evil
 " Men, *e.g.* of *Murderers*, went into the *Bodies of Beasts*,
 " those of *lascivious Men* into the *Bodies of Swine or Goats*,
 " *ποτὶ κόλασιν*, for *Punishment*, says *Timæus Locrus*. Was
 " this done for Punishment, and yet was no Regard paid
 " to the Morals of wicked Men¹?"

It hath been maintained (says he) *by some, that the old Philosophers held only a natural Metempsychosis,—but surely this Conclusion is too hasty.* Who it is that has been too hasty, is submitted to the Judgment of the Public: Whether I, in concluding from a hundred well-weighed Circumstances; or He, in censuring from one only, and that, as we shall see, neither weighed nor understood.

But it is too hasty, FOR when it was SAID, that the Souls of ill Men descended into *Asses* or *Swine*, they did not suppose the Souls of good Men so to descend. How are we to understand him? If by SAID be only meant *taught*, then, from what they said of the Souls of ill Men, nothing can be concluded, concerning what they SUPPOSED or *believed* of the Souls of good Men: Because it was their Way to say one Thing and suppose another. But if by SAID we are to understand *supposed* or *believed*, then I will readily grant, that, if they supposed the Souls of ill Men to descend, they did not suppose the Souls of good Men so to descend. But why this to me? Did I ever say, the old Philosophers supposed, that is, believed, that the Souls of ill Men descended into *Asses* or *Swine*? He would insinuate I did; as appears not only from his Address, but from his plain Allusion to the following Words of my Book: *However, it is true, that in his Writings he [Plato] inculcates the Doctrine of a future*

¹ p. 401, 402.

State of Reward and Punishment, — that the Souls of ill Men descended into Asses and Swine,—did he himself believe it? we may be assured he did not, &c. ^m.” Was it from these Words he gathered, that I held, *Plato supposed*, what, I own, he *inculcated*? Let him look again, and I imagine he will alter his Opinion. But he will still say, tho’ I do not hold, that the ancient Philosophers so *supposed*; yet, what is more to the Purpose, an *ancient Philosopher* does.

For thus he goes on: *The Souls of evil Men, e. g. of Murderers, went into the Bodies of Beasts, those of lascivious Men into the Bodies of Swine and GOATS, ποῖν κολασιν, for Punishment, SAYS TIMÆUS LOCURUS. Was this done for Punishment, and yet was no Regard paid to the Morals of wicked Men?* This is indeed amazing! The Reader cannot forget, that I quoted this very Passage at large ⁿ, as the most incontestable Evidence, that the *Pythagoreans* did not believe one Word of all they taught concerning the *Souls of ill Men descending into the Bodies of Brutes for Punishment*; Timæus Locrus prefacing the Relation of those Transitions in these very Words: *For as we sometimes cure the Body with unwholesome Remedies, when such as are most wholesome have no Effect, so we RESTRAIN THOSE MINDS BY FALSE RELATIONS which will not be persuaded by the true: There is a Necessity therefore of instilling the Dread of those foreign Torments. As that the Soul shifts and changes its Habitation; that the Coward is thrust ignominiously into a Woman’s Form, the Murderer imprisoned within the Furr of a Savage, the Lascivious condemned to animate a Boar or Sow, &c. ^o.* Ὡς γὰρ τὰ σάμαλα νοσώδεσι πόκα ὑγιαίνουσιν, εἴκα μὴ εἰκῇ τοῖς ὑγιεινολάτοις· ἔτω τὰς ψυχὰς ἀπείργουσιν ΨΕΥΔΕΣΙ ΛΟΓΟΙΣ, εἴκα μὴ ἀγῆλαι ἀλῆθεσι λέγουσιν· οὐδ’ ἀναγκαίως καὶ τιμωρίας ξέναις ὥς μελενδομορῶν τῶν ψυχῶν, τῶν μὲν δειλῶν εἰς γυναικεία σκάμνεα, ποῖν ὑβρίων ἐκιδιδόμμενα· τῶν δὲ μισαιφόνων εἰς θηρίων σώματα, ΠΟΤΙ ΚΟΛΑΣΙΝ· λάβων δ’, εἰς συῶν ἢ κάρων μορφάς P.

Did *Timæus Locrus* then suppose, i. e. believe, that the *Souls of ill Men descended into Brutes*? Does he not expressly tell us he supposed they did not, but that these Fables were inculcated in order to restrain the Populace from

^m p. 373, 374.

^o p. 363, 364.

ⁿ *Div. Leg.* Vol. I. p. 363. Ed. 2.

^p *De Anima Mundi*, sub fine.

Vice? To tamper then with my own Evidence, and to turn it against me in this Manner, as if nothing had been said, is so new a Stroke in Controversy, that we have yet no Name for it; but, on Occasion, shall now be able to assign it a Patronymic.

However, to do the Writer Justice, I must be so fair to say, that it may admit of some Doubt, whether ever he read this Passage in the *Divine Legation*, or only in the *Letters to Serena*, a Book that undergoes his Censure in the same Place where I am so unhappy to incur it. I am inclined to think the latter, from this remarkable Circumstance. The Author of the *Letters to Serena* had translated ἐς σὺν ἡ ΚΑΠΡΩΝ μορφὰς, into the *Forms of Swine or GOATS*^a. And so too has this Writer: into the *Bodies* (says he) of *Swine or GOATS*^r, which is so singular an Interpretation, that, notwithstanding the Proverb, that *good Wits jump*, I can hardly think them to be both original. But perhaps that excellent Correspondent of *Serena's* had here a mind to shew his Learning; and knowing, that the *Tyrrhenians*, a *Greek Colony in Italy*, used κᾰπρῶ for a *Goat*, he would conclude, by Analogy, that the *Locrians*, another *Greek Colony in Italy*, did the same. Again, *Timæus Locrus* says, ἐς θηρίων σώματα; *Toland*, into *Beasts of Prey*. This Writer, into the *Bodies of Beasts*. Here, where *Toland* is right, he leaves him; but sticks charitably by him while he continues wrong. For θηρίων signifies *Beasts of Prey*: And that precise Idea is required to complete the Sense; the Habitation of the *Murderer* being here spoken of. Again, *Timæus* says, ποτὶ κόλασιν, which *Toland* faithfully renders, for a *Punishment*; and which this Writer particularly insists on, as the very Cream of his Argument: *Murderers* (says he) went into the *Bodies of Beasts*, those of lascivious Men into the *Bodies of Swine or Goats*, ποτὶ κόλασιν, FOR PUNISHMENT, says *Timæus Locrus*. Was this done for *Punishment*, and yet, &c. But here I must retract my Suspicion; for from this last Instance it would seem, that he had read and compared my Translation, in which the *English* of those formidable Words, ποτὶ κόλασιν, is not literally to be found. And now the Secret is out. He seems to suppose I

^a *Letters to Serena*, p. 58.

^r p. 402 of his *Connexions*, &c.
omitted

omitted them as conscious of their containing some strange Matter against my general Opinion. But in truth, it was partly, because they were redundant; *Timæus* representing the whole Affair under the general Idea of a *Punishment*; and partly, because the Sense of *ποτὶ κόλασιν* was comprised in the Word *imprisoned*, which I used in the very Case to which those Words are applied. As to the Idea itself, that was so far from hurting my Argument, that it could not do without it.

He goes on: —*They* [the Philosophers] *really conceived Punishments and Rewards of evil or good Actions in Men; and some imagined a Punishment by the means of Transmigration, others imagined a Punishment inflicted in Hades, others BY IMMEDIATE ACTS OF PROVIDENCE; and all supposed Rewards or Punishments, notwithstanding they might treat as Fables the Stories of Cocytus, and Acheron*^s. He sticks to his Point, we see; and will still have it, that they believed a *Hell*, tho' they treated the Stories of *Cocytus* and *Acheron* as Fables, which (to tell him my Mind once for all) is just as if one should say, some among us believe the Miseries of the King's-Bench-Prison, and yet treat the Stories of Jailors, Turnkeys, Bailiffs and Attorneys as mere Fables. But what have *immediate Acts of Providence* to do in this Period? Did not I endeavour to prove, that *all* the Theistical Philosophers believed a Providence in this Life? These Words therefore, as they are found in a Paragraph that relates solely to my peculiar Opinion, I can consider in no other Light than as a false Insinuation *ad invidiam*.

I have now attended this Writer quite thro' his little Excursion. Let us see how he returns to himself: HOWEVER, *what I contend for, is, that the HEATHEN held a moral [a future] State of Rewards and Punishments, according to Good and Evil done here*^t. 'Tis worthy his Contention; and I should be ready to be his *Second* in it. But why then should he go out of his Way, and *contend* for another Thing that will do neither himself nor his Cause any Credit? I mean him Honour, when I say *his Cause*: For I really believe it to be the Cause of Christianity. Now, I con-

^s p. 402.^t p. 402.

ceive this not at all advanced by endeavouring to shew that the sacred Writers had but small reason for their harsh Censure of the *Greek Philosophy*^u; as the *contending* for its Orthodoxy in this Point effectively does. But I will suppose the sacred Writers have been misunderstood. And perhaps this may be no great Reflexion upon any Party; if we consider, that the *Jansenists*, scarce inferior to any in their Talents of Reasoning and Criticism, have strangely mistaken those Censures, while they understood them to be directed against human Science in general. I supposed therefore, that, to shew the sacred Writers only censured the *Greek Philosophy*, and that it deserved their Censure, was not one of the least Services one might render to our holy Religion. But the Occasion now seems to be more urgent. The Pretensions of these Philosophers have been of late highly advanced. The Author of the Book, intitled, *Future Rewards and Punishments believed by the Ancients*, hath, we see, forced the inspired Teachers of Mankind to give them the right hand of Fellowship. I had exposed their *prophane and vain Babblings* in one capital Instance, because it came directly into my particular Design; as well for that I thought it useful to Revelation in general. I did not then indeed imagine the Necessity so pressing. I may hereafter perhaps find Occasion to examine these spurious Rivals of the Apostolic Function on every Head of Morality and Religion, in the manner I have already done on one; and fully vindicate the Majesty of sacred Writ in the just Sentence it hath passed upon them.

^u See Vol. I. of *Div. Leg.* p. 434, & seq. Ed. 2.

A
L E T T E R

To the Right Reverend
Dr. RICHARD SMALLBROOK,
Lord Bishop of *Lichfield* and *Coventry*.

MY LORD,

THIS Trouble is occasioned by a Passage in your Lordship's *late* printed *Charge*^a to your Clergy, in which you have been pleased to censure me by Name with some Frankness, and, I am sorry to say, with equal Injustice.

The Regard due to your Lordship's *Order*, especially while in Discharge of your Function, would have certainly restrained me from complaining of ought that was a *mere Declaration* of your Lordship's Dislike of my Writings. It is your Lordship's *Right and Duty* to warn your Clergy against all ill Books: And your Lordship is, in that Place and on that Occasion, an authorized Denouncer of what are so. Had your Lordship therefore only said, that the *Divine Legation* was a very bad Book, I had not attempted, by any Address of this Nature, to disturb you in the quiet Possession of your Opinion. But when a Reason added to that Declaration turns your vague Censure into a *formal Accusation*, then, my Lord, it becomes equally my *Right and Duty* to defend my Character, if I find it mistaken.

To put the Publick therefore (which your Lordship has forced me to appeal to) in Possession of the Fact, it will be necessary to go so far back as to tell them what it is your Lordship says you propose to make the Subject of your *Charge*. It is (in your own Words) *to lay before your Clergy some Reasons, drawn from the Christian Revelation itself, which evince the Pretensions of Morality antecedently to divine Revelation, to be carried much too high, and vin-*

^a Printed in 1741, by J. and P. Knapton, Octavo.

dicare the Christian Faith, as well as Morality from those INVIDIOUS INSINUATIONS that have been CAST upon them by SEVERAL LATE WRITERS, WHO will occasionally be ANIMADVERTED upon in the following Discourse^b.

Your Lordship having gone thro' your *Reasons*, comes in Page 24 to draw your Inferences from them. The second of which, you tell us, is, "That tho' Christian
 " *Morality* is much superior to that of all other Religions,
 " yet it does not of itself, (that is, abstractedly from the
 " *Faëts* recorded in the Gospel, with which it is incor-
 " porated) evince the *Truth*, though it does most clearly
 " the *Excellency* of the *Christian* Religion. It is certain
 " (says your Lordship) that the Reasonableness and Sanc-
 " tity of the *moral* Precepts of the Gospel give great *Ad-*
 " *vantages* to Christianity, as compared with any other
 " Religion ancient or modern. And this of itself is suffi-
 " cient to give a well-disposed Mind very favourable
 " Thoughts of the Christian Religion, and to induce it to
 " make farther Enquiries into the Truth of those *Faëts*
 " which establish its Divine Authority. And this is as
 " far as the Argument needs to be pushed; and in fact it
 " is as far as one of the best modern Apologists, for the
 " Truth of Christianity, the most learned *Grotius*, in
 " Concurrence with the principal Apologists amongst the
 " Ancients, and more especially the famous *Origen*, thought
 " fit to urge it. It is clear that they thought themselves
 " obliged only to shew, that the *Morality of the Gospel*
 " does vastly excel that of all other Religious and Moral
 " Institutions, and is most worthy of God in all Respects.
 " But neither they nor any other thoughtful Persons,
 " that have formerly engaged on this Subject (as far as I
 " can recollect) have thought it reasonable to lay so great
 " a Stress on the Excellency of the *Morals* of the Gos-
 " pel, considered distinctly from the *Faëts* of the Gospel,
 " and in their own Nature solely, as necessarily to infer
 " from thence the Certainty of the Christian Revelation.
 " And much less have they asserted, as has been done by
 " some LATE WRITERS, that the Morality of the Gospel,
 " which they call the *internal Evidence* of it, (tho' indeed
 " it has not the Nature of *Evidence* properly so called)
 " is the strongest Evidence of the Truth of Christianity,

“ and is highly superior to all its *External Evidence*, that
 “ is, the Evidence which arises from the *Facts* recorded
 “ in the Gospel, and attended with other Attestations of
 “ ancient Writers, which support its Divine Authority”^c.
 This is all from your Lordship; where at the word WRITERS we find a Mark of Reference to the following Note — See Mr. Arscot's *Considerations on the Christian Religion*, p. 10, 51, 59, 60, &c. Part II. p. 63. Part III. and elsewhere. SEE TOO MR. WARBURTON'S DIVINE LEGATION OF MOSES, &c. p. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5,^d.

So that here, my Lord, I find this Proposition affirmed, That Mr. Warburton, in his *Divine Legation of Moses*, &c. p. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. has asserted THAT THE MORALITY OF THE GOSPEL, WHICH HE CALLS THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF IT, IS THE STRONGEST EVIDENCE OF THE TRUTH OF CHRISTIANITY, AND IS HIGHLY SUPERIOR TO ALL ITS EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

This, my Lord, is your Accusation; a very capital one it is; and such as, if true, would prove me devoid of common Sense, as well as in all other Respects unworthy the Character I bear of a Christian, a Clergyman, or a Defender of Revelation. I am therefore necessitated to call upon your Lordship, in this public Manner, either to make it good, or to give me Reparation. Your Lordship confines the Proof of your Accusation to the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth Pages of the First Volume of *the Divine Legation*. But as I am not disposed to chicanery in so serious a Matter, I hereby promise, that if either in those Pages, or in any other Pages of that Work, or in any thing I have ever written, preached, or said, your Lordship produces the Proposition in question as held and maintained by me, either in express Terms, or deducible by fair and logical Consequence, I promise, I say, to submit to any Censure your Lordship's self shall think fit to inflict. But if on the other hand you can produce no such Proposition, I shall then expect so much from your Lordship's Justice as to retract your Accusation in the same public manner you have been pleased to advance it.

I am, My LORD,

Your LORDSHIP'S

Most Obedient Servant,

W. WARBURTON.

Nov. 17, 1741.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th inst. in relation to the proposed publication of a new edition of the "Lectures on the Principles of Political Economy" by Mr. James Mill. I have the honor to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration. I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
Wm. W. W.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 11th inst. in relation to the proposed publication of a new edition of the "Lectures on the Principles of Political Economy" by Mr. James Mill. I have the honor to inform you that the same has been forwarded to the proper authorities for their consideration. I am, Sir, very respectfully,
Your obedient servant,
Wm. W. W.

Nov. 20, 1841

Wm. W. W.

Wm. W. W.

XXXX (3 Bde) XI.86



Warburton, William,

The divine legation of Moses demonstrated, on the principles of a
religious deist, from the omission of the doctrine of a future state of
reward and punishment in the Jewish dispensation in nine books
Bd.: 2,2

London [1742]

Polem. 2898 g-2,2

urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10777227-0